An Apologie

of priuate Maſſe, ſpred a
broade in writing without name
of the authour: as it ſeemeth, a-
gainſt the offer and proteſtacion
made in certayne Sermons by
the reuerent father Biſſhop of
Salſburie: with an anſwer to
the ſame Apologie, ſet foorth
for the maintenance and
defence of the
trueth.

Peruſed and allowed, by the reuerent
father in God Edmonde Biſſhop
of London, accordynge to the
order appoincted in the
Quéenes maieſties
Iniunctions.

Grinda

LONDINI.
Menſ. Nouemb.
1562.

BRITISH MUSEUM

An Apologie of priuate Maſſe.

Hauyng harde by ſundrie ſufficient reportz of large offers in open places before right honorable audience, more ſtoutly as wiſe men thinke then clarkely, for the maintenance of diuers vntruthes: and that the learned of the clergie here ſtande bounde in recogniſance, not to gaineſay any doctrine nowe preached, whiche otherwiſe are well able to controle all ſuch erronious phanſies lately deuiſed: not with ſtandinge I am nothyng comparable to the learned of the clergie, yet beyng brought vp in learning alwaies beyonde the ſeas, hauing before mine eyes the feare of God, and mine harte greatly lamentyng to ſe errour outface the truth, thought it good for the diſcharge of mine owne conſcience befoꝛe God and you, to diſcouer certeine vanities of yours, that the catholike church (once your mother) miſliketh in you. And ſo much the rather, becauſe god of his infinit goodnes hath called me backe againe from all ſuche lewde fanſies, by the godly inſtruction of the learned: in the whiche I was ones ſo fully perſwaded by euil bookes, that all that time I neither regarded God, noꝛ good religion, noꝛ any good conſcience beſides. And therfoꝛe truſtynge to doo ſome good with ſuche as ſimplicitie without malice hath perſwaded to ſtay, conſciens pꝛicked me to giue the aduenture: nothyng doubting but that God will bꝛing that to a good ende, the beginnynge whereof had no euill meanyng.

I. Cap. Againſt his refuſall in the firſt Epiſtle to D. Cole.

And to make mine entrie with you (maiſter Iewell) whiche are counted the greateſt clarke on your ſide, I meruell not a litle why you, beyng reputed a man of ſuch learnyng, vtterly refuſe to proue the doctrine you teache. Allegyng very ſlender cauſes of your refuſal: that ſerue the contrarie ſide, rather then yours. Your vocation to ſo highe a rome, the place where you taught, the honorable eſtate of the audience, which hard you, the doctrine you taught auctoriſed by the realme, as you alledge do not vnburden you from the proufe of your doctrin, but rather bourden you more to proue the ſame: becauſe your eſtate is now ſuche, that is bounde to rendre accompte of that you teach. Nor it is any diſhonour to the realme, if you be able to certifie that by learning, that they (as you ſay) haue paſſed by lawes, nor want of diſcretion at all in you, to teache them, that wold ſo gladly learn at your hande. For if a man may proue by conference of ſcriptures any article therin compriſed, either in the letter, or by argument boulted forth without anie diſhonour to God, or blemiſh to him that taketh the matter in hande, (as a A.

man in deede may) ſhall you counte the Realme diſhonoured , or want of diſcrecion in your ſelf, to proue ſuche doctrine (as your ſelfe doo publiſhe) becauſe it is auctoriſed by man, and by thaſſent of the Realme : whiche in time of your baptiſme aſſented to the contrarie , as al other chriſtian realmes did, without any contradiction at all, amongeſt the learned : whereas in this aſſente , as many learned clarkes, well knowen to the worlde, ſaid nay, and more to, then hitherto hath ſayd yea. And if the chief proufe of your doctrine be the aſſente of this realme , ſhall not other chriſtian realmes , that teache quite contrarie vnto you, reſt in doctrine auctoriſed by them, and al chriſtian realmes beſides : Here you ar driuen, if you reſt ſo ſtoutly vpon thaſſent of realmes, to confeſſe that the doctrine taught here is trew, becauſe this realme hath auctoriſed it : and the doctrine in ſtraunge realmes is trew, being quite contrarie to yours, because by like reaſon the realmes ther hath auctoriſed it. You haue no refuge in this caſe, but to ſay, that this realme folowed the ſcripture in ſuche doctrine, as they auctoriſed, and that other realmes folowed not the ſcripture in auctoriſinge the contrarie. I am wel contented with your anſwere. But where be the ſcriptures wherby the realme auctoriſed your doctrine? You may not ſay, it ſhall be greate diſhonour to the realme, to haue ſuch ſcripturs knowne, for want of diſcretion in you, to vtter them: as you ſeeme to ſay in your letters. Let vs know ſuche ſcriptures, as your truſt is moſt vppon, to proue your doctrine by, and we wil depart quietly. And as all wiſe men will counte it the office of a diſcrete man, either to ſtay ſuch as ſtagger, or to perſwade ſuche as verily thinke otherwiſe: So ſhall I not onely ſo thinke, but alſo if you giue me good cauſe why, yelde you greate thankes, and my pore ſeruice to. In

your ſilence herein, if you haue ought
to ſaie, you ſhall doo nothyng els but
hide the candell vnder yͤ buſſhel: where
as the order is to ſet it vpon the candel-
ſticke, to light all ſuche as are within
the houſe. If you haue no ſcriptures to
lay for you, then trouble our mother
the holy catholike churche no longer.
You ſtande in negatiues: you ſaye a-
gainſt priuate Maſſes and certaine o-
ther, which as you pretende, cannot be
proued. Haue wee not here good cauſe
to maruell that you, whiche ſtuddie ſo
marueilous reformacion of all doctrine
to the touche ſtone of ſcripture, will o-
penly profeſſe, bearyng ſuche a perſo-
nage in ſuche places of honour, ſuche
doctrine as can neither bee proued by
ſcripture, nor any other ſubſtancial re-
cord: and all becauſe it ſtandeth in ne-
gatiues? May not children in this ſort
deuiſe negatiues conteinyng falſe doc-
B. trine, and when they are called vpon to
proue it, ſay they are not bounde to

proue their aſſercions, becauſe they are egatiues: This dare I be bolde to ſay: f you had ſentence, or halfe ſentence, wordes, or halfe word in the ſcriptures, olde doctoures, generall counſels, or example of the primatiue churche againſt priuate Maſſes, al England had runge of it ere this day. But you haue none, as your ſilence importeth. It were either great folly to kéepe that ſecret, the whiche without any damage may do good to many, or meruelous enuie to encloſe that without gaine, which law and reaſon woulde haue to be commen. *Quicquid dando non deficit* (ſaieth ſaynct Auſtin) *Quamdiu habetur, & non datur: non dum habetur, quomodo habendum eſt.* All that decay not by beſtowynge, as long as they are had, and not beſtowed they are not yet had, as they ought to be had. The lawes may in diuers ſpeciall factes, not reſtrained to time and place, teach perhappes, that a negatiue can not be proued. But to ſay that a

Agaynſt his ſtayinge vpon the negatiue.

negatiue in doctrine, as yours is, can not be proued vpon only conſideracion that it is a negatiue, as your ſhifte is, that I am well aſſured no learned man hitherto euer taught: either in law, or in any other ſcience beſides. Ye the contrarie rather appereth in Logicke: the whiche teacheth the generall groundes of all diſputacions. Where wée haue in euerie figure, negatiue concluſions. And for other ſhort kinde of argumentes, there are as many places dialectical of the negatiues to deſtroy, as there are affirmatiues to builde on. So that ſhifte of deſcant can not ſerue your turne. Doeth not the ſcripture many times ioygne iſſue in the negatiue, and proue the ſame? Wée are not iuſtified by Moſes law, and ſo the like. Doeth not the Apoſtels proue it at large? But for as much as you are not able to proue the negatiue, I will no further trouble you therwith. Yet when there is an affirmatiue imploied in the negatiue,

tiue, as there is here, though I diſcharge you of very gentilnes from the proufe of thone, order of ſchooles will driue you to proue the other: though it were in factes, muche more in doctrine.

2. Cap.

Your negatiue was, that there was no priuate Maſſe at all, in the primatiue churche: thus you ſay, and ſhewe no cauſe why. This terme priuate, whiche you in this place firſt inuented, I meane Luthers ſchoole, may be taken concerning this matter diuers waies. One way, priuate is contrarie to common, to many. And in this ſignification, we neuer ſaied that any Maſſe was priuate. For the catholike church euer taught, that the Maſſe is a common or publique ſacrifice, reſtrained to none ſo, but that the whole churche, or any liuely membre therof, had thereby great commoditie: and might, beyng prepared, and well diſpoſed, bee partaker, not onely of the common Praier and Suffrages offered vp to God in the

A diſtictiō of priuate

A.

Maſſe, but alſo of the holy ſacramente of Chriſtes body and bloud therin conſecrated, and offered. Wée neuer yet priſoned vp the holy Sacrifice of the Maſſe, or the ſacramente therin receiued, or the vſe of ani of them, from any that diſpoſed them ſelues godly. If you had harde vs preache that the Maſſe is onely auailable to the prieſt, or to princes, or to vs of England, or to them of Italie, or to men, and not to women, or to ſuch as are aliue, and not to ſuche as are dead, or to ſay that none ought to receiue the Sacrament, but the prieſt, you might haue charged vs that wée wente aboute to encloſe that to ſome one ſorte of priuate profit, that ought to remaine in common for all ſortes of people. And in this wiſe wée neuer taught, that any Maſſe was priuate.

B. But you haue the other ſignificacion of this terme priuate. That is, the ſoole receiuynge of the Sacramente by the prieſt, imbarrynge none to communicate rate with him, yea rather reioyſing, if any would be ſo wel diſpoſed to receiue with him. And lamentynge, when he ſeeth the people ſo euill diſpoſed, that none will order theim ſelues ſo, that they may worthely receiue with him. And yet not forſyng theim to receiue, when they are not diſpoſed, nor readie. And in this meanyng of priuate, the catholike churche doeth teache, that the prieſt may receiue the Sacrament at Maſſe alone, when none other is diſpoſed to receiue with him. Now if you be able, wee require you to proue that affirmatiue included in your negatiue. Which is this. That euery prieſt or any other ought, when he receiueth the ſacrament, to haue companie to receiue with him in the ſame time and place, vpon payne of Gods high indignation: and then wee will yelde vnto you. If you be able to proue neither the negatiue, nor the affirmatiue, ſtorme not ſo ſore againſt the doctrine of the catholik churche, the whiche falſehed many times aſſaulteth, and was neuer yet able to ouerthrow.

3.Cap. As you ſay, there was no priuate Maſſe in the primatiue church, and ſay vntruly, ſo may you ſay and ſay truly, there was no chriſtian kynge in the Apoſtles time. There was no chriſtian man that then counted any thinge his owne of ſuche thynges as he poſſeſſed: but all were common. There was then no doctrine taught, but it was confirmed by miracles. There was no woman that might come with open face to the churche. There was no Biſſhop indewed with temporaltées. There was no diſtinction commonly of pariſhes. There was nothyng eaten that was mingled with bloud. There was no whole realmes turned to the fayth. There was no receiuyng of the Sacrament, but after ſupper. There was no infant but was houſled. And thus may wée rolle in a greate ſorte ſuche, there

That all thynges ſhuld not be brought to the forme of the primatiue churche.

was not truly, as you rolle in diuers of yours falſly. And will you I beſeeche ye reforme al thynges to the very ſtate of the primatiue churche now? Will you ſuppreſſe al chriſtian kyngs which were not in the Apoſtels time? Wyll you alter the ſtate now, and make all thinges to be common? Wyll you diſgrace all preachers that worke not miracles? Wyl you inforce women to hodwinke them ſelues in the churche? Will you rayle againſt biſſhoppes that keepe any temporalties? Wyll ye ſet men at liberty to doo their duty at what churche they will? Wyll ye inhibit the folkes to eate bluddynges, or Pigions, or Capons, ſuche as are killed by ſtifflyng? Will you inforce vs to be houſeled after ſupper? Wyll you houſell all babes and infantes againe? To call ſuche thynges to the ſtate of the Apoſtels time, and of the primatiue church againe, is nothyng els, but to enforce a taule man to come to his ſwadlynge clothes

A.

B.

The primatiue churche, the ſtate of infācy.

clothes, and to crie alarme in his cradl again. I truſt when you ſay there was no priuate Maſſe in the primatiue churche, not withſtandinge you diſalowe priuate Maſſe, yet you wil alowe Maſſe to bee in the primatiue churche: or els wiſdome would haue ſayed more generally, there was no Maſſe at all, nor priuate, nor common. &c. And yet there is an open difference betwéen theſe two ſentences: there was no priuate Maſſe at that time, and there ought to be no priuate Maſſe at any time. In the one, wée conceiue the vſe of that age, not withſtandynge the law of the churche euen then might ſtande indifferently to the contrarie, vpon circumſtances and good conſideracions. And in the other, wée preciſely conceiue what the lawe doeth determine, either lawfull or vnlawfull.

C. An argumente of the cōpariſon of the times.

The conſtant faith, the pure life, the feruent charitée, the contempte of the worlde, that then floriſhed ſo amongeſt ſuch as profeſſed Chriſt, might cauſe perhappes that no Maſſe was celebrated, but that diuers chriſtians, and ſpecially lokyng for continuall perſecucion, would be houſeled there at, and be alwaies ſure to haue their viaticũ, as it is termed in the olde Cannons, that is to ſay, their viage prouiſion. In that ſtate of burnynge charitee, and of contempt of the worlde, and al the pleaſures therof, ſome of the people, perhaps of their owne accorde, did alwaies willyngly and gladly prepare theim ſelues at euery Maſſe to be houſled with the prieſt: And will you now in the ſtate of keycolde charitee, when the people D. are nothyng willyng to diſpoſe theim ſelues to receiue their houſill, plucke E. the prieſt from the aulter, whoſe office is to offer that dayly ſacrifice for the people, vnleſſe ther be that wil receiue? Will you imbarre him that is bounde to offer vp the dayly ſacrifice of dutie, becauſe they will not diſpoſe theim ſelues to receiue their houſill? Who, as concernyng ſo often receiuyng, are not bounde, but ſtande at libertie, The church doth exhorte them to yͤ frequentacion of their houſil, but geueth no cōmaundement to binde them: as Chriſt ſaied, *si vis perfectus eſſe, vade, & vende omnia quæ habes, & da pauperibus.* If thou wilt be perfit, goe and ſell all that thou haſt, and geue it to the poore. Whiche imploieth the nature of a counſell, to exhorte men to yͤ higheſt degrée of chriſtianitie, conſernyng the beſtowyng of the goods of the worlde: and yet is no commaundement to binde any that are not ſo diſpoſed. Euen ſo wée may exhort and counſell folkes to frequent the receiuyng of their rightes without any commaundement to binde them. Now the ley men are at libertie, conſernyng the frequentacion: the prieſt is bounde to the frequentacion. Is it then reaſon that he, that may chooſe whether he will frequently receiue or no, ſhould, when he is not diſpoſed, cauſe him to offende the law of God, that is bounde therto? If you had any ſuche texte in the holy ſcripture to binde the prieſt neuer to ſay Maſſe without ſome to communicate, as this texte, *Si vis perfectus eſſe, vade vende.* Séemeth to commaunde him that will be perfit, to ſell all that he hath, and beſtowe it vpon the poore. Lorde how woulde ye then triumphe: becauſe you had then ſome coulour agaynſt priuate Maſſe. And yet when the matter were well bulted, you ſhall neuer be able to proue any cõmaundement therby againſt the ſole receiuing of the Sacrament by the prieſt, but a counſell to exhorte him, if it might be, to the higheſt and moſt perfit eſtate. F. But to preſcribe of neceſſitée that there ought, vpon paine of Gods indignacion to be a company to communicate with the prieſt at euery Maſſe, or els forbeare the celebracion of the holy ſacrifice, hauyng no title of any ſuche coulour in the holy ſcripture, I wyll not cal that by the name that I may iuſtly, but will temper the matter, and terme it an itchyng folly, to alter all thinges that are well ſetled alredie.

4. Cap.

S. Chriſoſtome in his thirde homely vpon the epiſtle to yͤ Epheſians in his complainte there doeth ſo ſet forth the matter, as it is to be wiſhed both what the people ſhould doo, & what the prieſt may do. If the people wil not folow his exhortacions, than no man, I ſuppoſe without great impudẽcie, wil any lenger ſtand in yͤ denial therof.

A.

A ſimilitude that companie is not neceſſarie

For as we may well & godly wiſhe that al folkes were ſo wel agreed that al ſuites in the law might ſurceaſſe: and yet this godly wiſhe when any contention ſhoulde chaunce, yͭ cannot otherwiſe be finiſhed doth not inhibit but yͭ men may ſew for their right. For yͤ higheſt or the perfeteſt ſtate doth not extinguiſhe yͤ meane or the lowe: Euen ſo all good men may wiſhe that al chriſtian people were alwaies ſo deuoute and wel diſpoſed, that they might with goddes fauour, receiue their houſil daily. And yet were it iniurie becauſe al wil not, to inhibite ſuch as wolde. Or if none wolde, to imbarre the prieſt that is bounde to offer vp the daily ſacrifice for him ſelf & the people.

The prieſt of duetie bounde to ſacrifice.

S. Chriſoſtom writeth thus: *In aliis quidem tēporibus quū puri frequenter ſitis, non acceditis, In paſcha vero licet ſit aliquid a vobis perpetratū acceditis, O conſuetudinem, O preſūptionē, ſacrificiū fruſtra quotidianū offerimus. In caſſum aſſiſtimus altari, nullus eſt qui cōmunicetur, hic non vt temere cōmunicemini dico, ſed vt vos dignos reddatis.* At other times ſaieth he although you be for the moſt parte in cleane life you come not, but at Eaſter you come, thoughe you haue done ſomwhat amiſſe. Phie vpon that cuſtome, phie vpon ſuch preſumpcion, the daily ſacrifice is in vaine. We ſtand at thaulter for nought. There is none to be howſlid. I ſpeake not theſe thinges becauſe you ſhoulde receiue your houſil raſhly, but for thintēt you ſhould

5. Cap. A.

IX

make your ſelues woorthie. In theſe wordes of S. Chriſoſtom, this doeth firſt appere, that at that time the people at Eaſter wold receiue their howſill in what caſe ſo euer they were in, good or bad. And at other times of the yere though they were in good caſe and pure life, fit to receiue, yet they woulde refraine the receiuyng of their rightes. And therefore he blameth and in maner crieth out vpon that cuſtome, whereby the people rather conſider the preſcript time of Eaſter to receiue, then a cleane life and pure conſcience. For as godly people may at any time receiue their howſill without reſtraint to any one preſcript time in the yere, and the oftener they ſo receiue the ſame, the more their godly deuocion therby doeth increaſe, euen ſo the vngodly ones are rather commaunded to doo penance for their euill life, and to make them ſelues redy and worthie, then to come raſhely without ſerche of conſcience, without triall of them ſelues, without penance done for their offences, to receiue their howſel only vpon conſideracion of preſcripte time, becauſe they had vſed of longe time to do ſo. And this is the preſumpcion he crieth out vpon, that pricketh the people vpon cuſtom to receiue vnworthely: and yet at other times, where non woulde receiue, neither ſuche as might worthely, nor ſuch as coulde not for their euill life. Sainct Chriſoſtom ſaieth: that there was *Sacrificium quotidianum*. Euery day, dayly ſacrifice, euery day Maſſe, euery day the prieſt ſtode at the Aulter, either to exhorte ſuche as were meet to receiue, or to counſell ſuche as were of euill liues to penance, that they after might bee able to receiue. But his exhortacion was in *Caſſum* at the aulter. And his exhortacion to the people to communicate in the celebracion of the dayly ſacrifice was *fruſtra* in vaine. Not for becauſe the dayly ſacrifice in the Maſſe

B.

was nothyng auaylable, but becauſe he
loked that the people woulde diſpoſe
them ſelues to doo as they were exhorted.
And that was vaine, becauſe *nullus
eſt qui communicetur*. There was none
that woulde be howſlid. And yet the
prieſt did celebrate notwithſtandynge.
For it is ſaied, that he ſtandeth at the
Aulter, and what to doo but to celebrate
the daily ſacrifice. Can you call that a
C. daily ſacrifice that is not daily offered
vp? or that a daily ſacrifice that is not
celebrated but once in the yere, at Eaſter?
At the which time the people vſed
to receiue: all other times they refrained,
D. *Quia nullus eſt qui cōmunicetur*. There
is none to communicate. Is it not euident
by this complainte of S. Chriſoſtom
that the prieſt did his duetie, not
withſtanding ther was none to receiue
with him? Or els if he were conſtrained
to refraine when none woulde receiue
with him, doeth it not appeare
that then it foloweth that he did celebrate

brate but at Eaſter onely, for then he had companie, and at other times he lacked. *Quia nullus eſt qui communicetur.* And then how coulde it be calde *Sacrificium quotidianum*. The daily ſacrifice. Doubtles it coulde not. And therfore it is plaine that then the prieſt did his duetie in celebracion of the Maſſe, though none receiued with him. Haue wée not founde then that in Chriſoſtomes time there was priuate Maſſe, as you do terme it? Why ſay you that in all other thinges wée holde contrary vnto you. Wée had ſome colour other in ſcriptures, or olde doctours. But in ſuch doctrine as you made your entrie vpon, wherof this is one, you are aſſured wée had no colour at all to make any profe in very déede. You here that Chriſoſtome teſtifieth the vſe of his time for priuat Maſſe plainely and flatly without colour at all. What colour I pray you haue you, either in ſcriptures, olde Doctours or counſels, againſt priuate

Maſſe: As it appereth hitherto nothing
at all.

6. Cap. Your owne principles, that ſuche
as ye are firſt inuented, will driue you
in maner to confeſſe the catholike doc-
trine in this behalfe. You ſay againſt
A. preſcript faſtynge daies, the doctrine
that is not euidently determined by
ſcripture, ought to ſtande free and in-
different. But the doctrine of the neceſ-
ſitie of companie to receiue with the
prieſt is no where determined ſo, by the
ſcripture: it ſhoulde ſtande then by
your vaine principle as free, and a
thyng indifferent. And will you haue
freedome in ſcripture driuen to neceſſi-
tie without ſcripture: will you clogge
vs with the very title and ſilable of the
ſcriptur and ſucke out a bonde of neceſ-
ſitie from thence to enforce vs to doo in
all poinctes the lyke, and ſpecially in
the order of the miniſtracion of the holy
B ſacrament of the Aulter: Then muſte
wee aſke you how dare you miniſter the
ſacra-

ſacramente in Englande, ſéynge that Chriſte onely miniſtred it in Iurie? And here you muſte confeſſe the obſeruacion of the place preciſely not to bée neceſſary. Why miniſter you vnto women, when Chriſte miniſtred it vnto men? Here you will graunt that you are not conſtrained by Gods law vnto the maſſe. Why doo you miniſter it in the mornyng before dinner, whẽ chriſt miniſtred it in the euenyng after ſupper? Trew it is, you will ſay, that Chriſt miniſtred it after ſupper, but he gaue no law to binde vnto that time. Why enterpriſe you to doo that vppon Sondaies often, that Chriſte did once vpon Sherethurſday? You wil anſwer in likewiſe that there is no ſcripture that commaundeth vs to forbeare any day in the yere. Why do you that openly in the churche, that Chriſte did ſecretly in a parler? Becauſe wée haue no commaundemente in Scripture to forbeare any propertie of place. Why do you miniſter it to the layties, where Chriſt gaue it only vnto the Apoſtels ẏ were prieſtes? You wil ſay ẏ wée haue no cōmaundement to exclude any ſtate of mē. Why do you miniſter it to more or fewer, when chriſt miniſtred it only vnto twelue? And what anſwere haue you here, but to ſay as you ſaid before, ẏ as place, ſexe, time, day, degrée, ſtate of people, ſecretneſſe, are nothing aperteinyng as neceſſarie to ẏ ſubſtance of the ſacrament: ſo number is but an accident or a ornament rather to bewtifie ẏ deuocion of chriſtian people in receiuynge the ſacrament, then therunto apperteinyng as neceſſarie vnto the ſubſtance. And thus may you perceiue that when you require the like doyng to Chriſte herein in euery ſmall poincte or title in vs, as in place, time, ſexe, day, ſtate of people, ſecretneſſe, number, you deceiue your ſelues, and others. Takyng theſe thynges to be neceſſarie for the ſafegarde of the ſubſtance of the ſacrament, the whiche are nothinge els but very accidentes: the alteracion whereof doo lie in the diſcrecion of ſpirituall gouernours, without damage or hurte doone to the ſubſtance of the ſacrament or the vſe there of: and are to be computed amongeſt ſuche thinges, as ſaincte Paule ſpeaketh of, when he wrote. *Cetera cum venero diſponam.* I wil ſet the other thynges in order, when I come.

But the greate matter you harpe on 7. Cap.
to haue companie together in one place to receiue at any time with the prieſt is becauſe that in the vſe of this ſacramēt ther ought to be a cōmuniō. And I pray A.
you is not there a cōmunion among all chriſtians in praier? For in our praier we ſay our father, not my father which arte in heauen, thy wil be doon in earth as it is in heauen, not in mée as it is in heauē, geue vs this day our daily bread, wée ſay not geue mée this day my daily bread, forgeue vs our treſpaſſes, wée ſay not forgeue mée my treſpaſſes. &c. B.

Whereby wee know that wee communicate in praier with all chriſtendome beyng members of one miſticall bodie of Chriſte. And will you inhibite mee to ſay my Paternoſter when I am alone in my chamber, voyde of companie to ſay with mee, or will you ſhutte vp al chriſtendome in ſome narow rome, that thei may be togethers at one time to ſay the Lordes praier? Or will you graunte that there may be a Communion in praier amongeſt all chriſtians without any reſpecte to haue them together at one time in any one place, A and that there can be no communion in the vſe of the Sacrament, vnleſſe all the communicantes be together in one place and at one time? Haue you any ſcripture to leade you to ſay that the communion in the vſe of the ſacrament muſt of neceſſitee haue all the communicantes in one place at one time cloſſe vp, more then the cōmunion in praier? B. One of the articles of the Creede is, *Credo ſanctorum communionem.* I beléeue the communion of ſainctes. I beléeue wée haue communion in Baptiſme, in penance, in confirmacion, in extreme vnction, in praier, in faſtyng, in almes déedes. And muſt all they that practiſe any of theſe, be driuen to do it, at one place, in one ſeaſon, or els to haue no parte of ſuch a communion as there is compriſed in theſe holy ſacramentes? Is this your doctrine? Wher haue you theſe in ſcripture? There is an olde doctour called Dioniſius; that teacheth vs why it is called a communion. Not becauſe it requireth vnitie and idemptitie of time and place in the communicantes: but becauſe al chriſtians therby beyng liuely members of one body firſt are brought to an vnitée with Chriſte their head, and then euery member with the miſticall body: and then euerie member with other. So that in the workynge of this merueilous vnitie, number, time, and place are no princi-

pall

pal doers, but forreners and very ſtrangers in deede. And the place of Sainct Paule meaneth no leſſe in the firſt to the Corinthes. *Quoniã vnus panis & vnũ corpus multi ſumus, omnes quidẽ de vno pane & de vno calice participamus*, wherby we here yͤ chriſtians are pertakers of one lofe, and yet there is no one particular place able to receiue thẽ, nor yet no one particular lofe able to ſerue thẽ. Surely as touchinge your fancie to haue of neceſſitie the communicantes cloſed vp in one place, there to be ſerued at one eſpecial time, or els to be no partakers C. of the communion, it wil fal in proceſſe of reaſoning to ſo many follies: that we muſt know how large the place muſte be and how longe you will appoinct the time apperteining to one communion. And as for the place when the multitude of the communicantes are verie greate, whether may be a communion betwixt him that receiueth at the Aulter in our Lady chapell in Paules, and him that receiueth in the loweſt place of the weſt ende of Paules church. If there may, why are they not partakers of one communion that receiue in two diuers churches in London not ſo farre diſtante the one from the other, as our Ladie chappel is from the weſt ende of Paules? And if they can not, let vs knowe why: and haue ſome ſcripture for proufe therof. If they may, why may not the communicantes be partakers of one communion in three churches: and why not be partakers of one cõmunion in foure or fiue churches no farther diſtant? If not, limit you then the furtheſt diſtance that a communion may be had in, and bringe in ſcriptures, doctours, or any counſels to proue the limitacion, and wee wil crie creake. And in like maner wee may reaſon for the appoinctmente of time. Appoincte you the longeſt time that a communion may be had, and ſhew ſome good euidence for your limitacion. And likewiſe we wil crie creake. You driue men to theſe trifels that the worlde may know you hange in nifels.

8. Cap. A.

Eraſmus Roterodamus in his epiſtle that he wrote againſt falſe goſpellers, reporteth how they were wonte in the olde time in the primatiue churche, to deliuer euery one yͤ ſacrament in their handes to beare home with them and receiue it when their deuocion ſerued. *Olim* (ſaieth he) *corpus domini, dabatur in manu vt domi cum vellent ſumerent qui accepiſſent*. The Lordes body in olde time was deliuered into folkes handꝭ to the entente that they who hadde taken it might receiue it when they woulde. When diuers people tooke the Lordes body in their handes to receiue it at home in their ſeuerall houſes when their deuocion ſerued them to receiue it, are any yet ſo vnwiſe to thinke that they that ſo receiued it were either in one place, cõſidering their houſes were ſeuerall, or at any one time, conſid

ring

ringe the varietie of their deuocions, willes, purpoſes, and trade of life? Do you not ſe in theſe few wordes that the partakers of any one communion were not wonte to be clogged to receiue it in any place or at any one eſpeciall time? Do not you manifeſtly heare a reſeruacion of the ſacramente confeſſed here? And where as it was deliuered in their handes, as wine is not, vnderſtande you not thereby a communion vnder one kinde? But you will ſay it was but Eraſmus reporte. But I ſay he reported it as he founde in auncient writers. And Eraſmus pardie was wont to be a great man amongeſt you: and do you ſo litle eſtéeme him now? You haue ouerrun him (I graunte) as you haue done Luther, that was once your God. Eraſmus is not the firſt father of this reporte. But Tertulian him ſelfe whiche floriſhed not long after the Apoſtles time: in his ſeconde booke that he wrote to his wyfe, repor-

B.

teth no leſſe. How that the chriſtian wife kepte it cloſe from hir huſbande, beyng a Panime, that ſhe receiued euerie mornynge ſecretly before meate. And if it ſo happed that he eſpied it, that he woulde thinke it were breade: and not that which chriſtian men toke it to be. *Non ſciet maritus quid ſecreto ante omnem cibum guſtes. Et ſi ſciuerit, panem non illum credit eſſe qui dicitur.* Thy huſbande ſhall not know what thou doeſt eate ſecretly before thy meate. And if he do know it, he beléeueth that it is breade: and not he whome wée call it. Ponder theſe wordes well: and ſe whether it agréeth not with Eraſmus reporte. c. 5.

When the chriſtian wife did ſecretly receiue the holy ſacrament, was there any company receiued with hir? Can a thyng done in companie, be ſecret? Or coulde ſhe kéepe cloſe from the Panime hir huſbande that thyng that ſhould be often practiſed in any open aſſemblie? Were not thinke you the panimes that at that time were the greater numbre, diligent to ſearche what the chriſtians did? Séemeth it not in hir ſecret receiuyng before all meates, that ſhe reſerued the ſacrament at home, to receiue it when ſhe woulde? And where Tertulian ſaieth, that if it chaunced that her huſbande knew what ſhe eate, he would thinke it to be bread, (makyng no mencion he woulde thinke it to bee wine) and not the very body of Chriſt, as the chriſtians do confeſſe. Furthermore ſéemeth not this woman to haue receiued it vnder one kinde? For hir huſband that ſaw hir eate the fourme of bread, that was wonte to be firſt receiued, woulde ſone haue perceiued when ſhe dranke the fourme of wyne, that ſhoulde be immediately receiued after. To conclude, it appereth by theſe olde writers, that this woman receiued alone without any company to receiue with hir. And that ſhe reſerued the ſacrament with hir at home, to receiue at hir owne houſe when ſhe liſte. And laſt of al, that ſhe receiued vnder one kinde. S. Ciprian alſo the greate clerke and glorious marter touchyng the reſeruacion of the holy ſacramente, in the firſt ſermon *De lapſis*, telleth of a woman whiche reſerued the Sacrament in hir coffer at home that went aboute vnreuerently to open the coffer: how a fier C. roſe vp from thence and ſo feared hir, that ſhe durſte not to touche it. His wordes be theſe. *Cum quædam arcam ſuã in qua domini ſanctum fuit manibus indignis tentaſſet aperire, igne inde ſurgente deterrita eſt ne auderet attingere.* When a certeine woman (ſaith he) vnworthely aſſated to open hir owne coffer, wherein the holy body of our Lorde was, a fier roſe thens, and feared hir that ſhe durſt not touche it at all. Se you not yet where Eraſmus learned that the laye people toke the ſacramente in their handz and reſerued it at home, to receiue it reuerently when their deuocion ſerued?

Hath not Tertulian reported yͤ ſame? Doth not ſaincte Ciprian in the former wordes importe the ſame? The womā had the ſacrament in hir coffer at home: and will you denay the reſeruacion? She came vnreuerentely to open the coffer, and to receiue the ſacrament beyng alone: and will you ſuppreſſe the ſole receiuyng? The fier roſe vp from thens, and for feare ſhe touched it not: woulde God haue wrought this miracle if the ſacrament had béene nothyng els but common bread when it was reſerued? Cyrill that auncient father ſaieth, that it is not only folly to deny the reſeruacion, but a very madneſſe in déede. D. He writeth to Caloſirius, that they are mad that ſay the body of chriſt remaineth not in ſuche portions conſecrated, as are kepte to the next day after the conſecration. *Inſaniunt igitur dicentes* (ſaieth he) *miſticam benedictionem a ſanctificatione ceſſare, ſi quæ reliquiæ eius remanſerint in ſequentem diem. Non enim* *mutabitur ſacro ſanctum corpus chriſti, ſed virtus, benedictio & viuificatiua gratia magis in eo eſt.* They are then madde that ſaie the miſticall benediction or bleſſing leaueth from the ſanctification, if any leauyng remaine of it till the next day. For the very holy body of Chriſte ſhall not be changed. But the power and vertue and the liuely quickenyng grace is continually abiding in it without company to receiue. Whē ye heare Chriſoſtome tell of the dayly ſacrifice, when you heare the auncient father Cirillus, call them madde, that denie the reſeruacion, when yée heare him ſay plainly and flatly that there is no alteracion in the very holy body of Chriſte, though it be kept, and the vertue, and ful power of the conſecracion, and the liuely quicknynge grace doeth continew ſtil in the holy porcions that are reſerued: when S. Ciprian that holy martir maketh reporte of the holy ſacrament reſerued at home in the womans coffer, to receiue when hir luſt, when deuocion ſerued hir: and when he ſheweth that God wrought the myracle in the ſtirryng of the fier from it, becauſe ſhe thought to vſe it vnreuerently, to cauſe hir to forbeare. When Tertulian afore that agreeth with the ſame, and when Eraſmus Roterodame, a man famous in his time, recordeth the matter as he had learned it of theſe holy fathers and other: that the people receiued it in their handes, receiued it at home, receiued it when euery man ſaw his time: Shal any man cõtinue ſo impudent to denie that euer people vſed the ſole receiuyng without company, or deny the reſeruacion? The Scripture ſaieth, *In ore duorum vel trium. &c.* Two or thrée witneſſes are able to trie any matter: and eſpecially ſuch witneſſes as theſe are, men of holy life, auncient fathers of greate learnyng, called forth to witneſſe yͤ trueth from euery quarter of the worlde, ſome from Aſia, ſome from Africa, ſome from Europa. &c. What ſay you to Satyrus, E. that hanged the holy ſacrament aboute his necke in a ſtole, when he wente to the ſea? What ſay you to the greate clarke S. Ambroſe biſſhop of Millayn, that praiſed him greatly for his ſo doyng? Apered not there a reſeruacion? And I trow vnder one kinde, vnleſſe your brayne will ſerue you to encloſe wine in a ſtole, as mine will not.

9. Cap. What ſay you by Syrapion, who beyng in diſpaier of his life, ſente for the prieſt to miniſter him the ſacrament in the night ſeaſon. But when the prieſt lay ſicke in his bed, and coulde not goe him ſelfe, he toke Syrapions ladde the Sacramente in his hande, and bad him moyſte it, and ſo miniſter it into the mouthe of his ſicke maiſter. The prieſt was ſicke and coulde not riſe. The lad came in the night time, the prieſt deliuered the ſacramente into his hande, he bad him moyſte it, and géeue it to

the

A.

the ſicke. And doeth not this proue bothe that the prieſt had reſerued it, and the moyſtynge thereof that the ſicke man tooke it vnder one kinde, and when he ſent no more then woulde ſerue the ſicke man, was not there the howſelyng of one alone without companie: The twelfth Cannon of Nicene counſell prouideth for ſuche as are like to departe this life, to receiue the ſacrament or they departe. And if any ſuche that is in ẏ caſe howſeled chaunce to recouer, then to be amongeſt the communicantes praier. The wordes be theſe *De iis qui recedunt ex corpore, antiqua legis regula obſeruabitur etiā nunc. Ita vt ſi quis forte recedat ex corpore, neceſſario vitæ ſuæ viatico non defraudetur. Quod ſi deſperatus aliquis recepta communione ſuperuixerit: ſit inter eos qui ſola oratione communicant.* Concernynge thoſe that departe this life, the olde rule of the lawe ſhall be kept now alſo. So that any be like to departe this life he be not diſceiued of

his neceſſarie viage prouiſion for his
life. If he that was in diſpaier of life after
ẏ he receiued the cōmunion chaunce
to recouer, let him be amongeſt them
that do communicate by praiers onely.
The holy auncient counſell of all the
learned fathers at Nice, thought it
conuenient that ſuche as were like to
die, ſhould be howſeled before their departyng:
B. And coulde this rule be vnuiolably
kepte amongeſt ſo many caſualties
of ſickneſſe and ſodeine infectiones
and diuers other chaunces that fall at
diuers and ſundrie times bothe by day
and night, vnleſſe the holy ſacramente
were reſerued: And vnleſſe euery man
receiued as neceſſitie ſerued alone without
company, when neceſſitie ſo required:
Some time the prieſt as Chriſoſtome
ſaieth in the celebracion of the
dayly ſacrifice receiueth without the
people: and ſometime the people without
the prieſt: and ſome time one alone
without any company at all, as we

haue at large ſhewed afoꝛe.

In the biſſhops and pꝛieſtes abſence, the Deacons receiued alone, if they were diſpoſed to receiue, as the fourtéenth Cannon of thauncient and olde counſel of Nyce hath taken oꝛder. The woꝛdes be theſe. *Peruenit ad ſanctum concilium ꝙ in locis quibuſdam & ciuitatibus, preſbiteris diaconi ſacramenta porrigant. Hoc neqꝫ regula, neqꝫ conſuetudo tradit, vt ij, qui offerendi ſacrificij poteſtatem non habent, hiis qui offerunt corpus chriſti porrigant. Sed & illud innotuit quod quidam diaconi etiam ante epiſcopū ſacramēta ſumant. Hæc ergo omnia amputentur, & accipiant ſecundum ordinem poſt preſbiteros ab epiſcopo vel a preſbitero ſacram communionem. Quod ſi non fuerit in preſenti vel epiſcopus, vel preſbiter, tunc ipſi proferant & edant.* It is repoꝛted to the holy counſell that in certaine places and cities the deacons deliuer the ſacrament to the pꝛieſtes, Neither rule, neither cuſtome taught this, that they that haue no authoꝛitée to offer ſacrifice 10. Ca

A

ſhould deliuer the body of chriſt to them that offer it. And an other thyng alſo came to our eares that there are certain deacons who receiue the ſacrament before the Biſſhop. Wherfore let all ſuch thinges be cut of, let them receiue the holy cōmunion orderly after the prieſtꝭ of the biſhops or prieſt. And if the biſhop or the prieſt be abſent, let them ſelues bryng it forth and eate it: If the deacons, as it appereth by this Canon, that had no auctoritie to conſecrate, and to offer the ſacrifice of Chriſtes body and bloud, might in the biſhops or prieſtꝭ abſens, fetch forth the ſacrament, and receiue it, can you denie but it was reſerued? And that the ſame grace of Chriſtes body remained in the holy ſacrament after the conſecracion in the biſhoppes and prieſtes abſence? Which coulde by no meanes be conſecrated, but by the biſhoppes and prieſtes preſence.

A. I will not cauill with you vpon the terme aboue reherſed in the Cannon, concernyng the deacons, that they might in the biſſhoppes and prieſtes abſence, bryng forth the ſacramente and eate it: whiche is proper to the forme of bread, and not to the forme of wine: and thereby declare that the deacons receiued it but in one kinde: Notwithſtandynge I might as well ſtande therein and better to, then you ſtande vpon *Accipite & manducate, & bibite ex hoc omnes*, to driue the ſacrament immediatly without any reſeruacion to his vſe, and that at euery communiō there muſt of neceſſitie be a company to receiue with the prieſt, and euery one of the lay people ought of neceſſitie to receiue the ſame in bothe kindes. I wil B. not I ſay vſe no ſuch daliance vpon the worde, eate in the Cannon as you vſe in take eate and drinke al of this in the vſe of the ſacrament very ſophiſtically. But let go all ſuche vauntages vpon titles. I am contented to vſe none other prouſe, but ſuche, as al men that haue any diſcretion, do ſo euidently perceiue to be ſo good, that they are neuer able to finde any occaſion in the worlde to controlle it. Such as I haue vſed before for the proufe of priuate maſſe, reſeruation the ſoole receiuynge or miniſtracion of the ſacramente in certaine caſes vnder one kinde, to haue ben vſed in the ſtate of the primatiue churche.

v. Cap.

Reade S. Cyprian in his fifte ſermon De lapſis, there ſhal you ſe that the deacon gaue an Infante, that had receiued before parte of ſuch meates as were ſacrifiſed vp to the Idoles, a porcion of Chriſtes bloud out of the Chalis. And as ſone as the infante receiued it, it was wonderfully vexed, becauſe it was meruelous diſhonour to the bloud of Chriſte to be powred into the mouthe that was a litle before defiled with the Idoles ſacrifice. And therby may you vnderſtande that the infante receiued the ſacrament of the Deacon vnder the forme of wine onely, and not vnder the forme of breade. For by that reaſon if the infante had receiued it vnder the forme of bread, before beyng parte of the ſacrament as precious as the other, it ſhould haue been vexed very ſore, before the cup had ben offered it. But the firſt vexacion that it had was when the Deacon gaue the ſacrament in forme of wine. And therfore it is euident that the deacon gaue not the infant the ſacrament vnder the forme of bread. And was not this a communion vnder one kinde only? You haue harde now I ſuppoſe not a worde, or halfe worde, not one ſentence, or half a ſentence as your callyng was, but many, and full prouſes againſt certaine of your aſſertions. And by theſe you haue good cauſe to diſtruſt all the reſt of your doctrine.

Thus far my leaſure ſerued me, be- 12, Cap.
yng otherwiſe occupied with buſineſſe ynough, to anſwer in the defence of my ſpirituall mother the catholike church. Not for becauſe it was our parte, that

are in poſſeſſion , to render any reaſon for our right , wherein preſcription of time out of minde is a ſufficient barre: but partely,becauſe I ſaw your importunitie in callyng vpon them to ſtrike, that you had bounde in recogniſaunce of great ſommes to be forfaited,if they had gone aboute to geue you any blow. So that you may perceiue well by this, that they are better armed , then you thought they were : when I , who am nothyng in compariſon of the learned Doctours of this realme , beyng a man A. of no greate reading,but in ſtories, am yet able thus to ſay in ſo good a matter, that I truſt you will here after leaue your importunitie of prouokyng ſo many learned men of this realme,to ſhew what euidence they haue for the truth. It had béen more reaſonable , that you (that woulde diſpoſſeſſe vs of the intereſt wée haue in the trew doctrine, that the catholike church firſt taught vs, and hath recorded ſufficiently in hir practiſe theſe. xv.c. yeres and more, and in recordes of writers this . ix . hundred yeres and . lx . as your ſelfe do ſéeme to confeſſe) ſhould ſhew ſufficient cauſes, why wée ought to be diſpoſſeſſed: rather then wée to lay for our ſelues proufes to kéepe poſſeſſion. I meruell that you thinke it not hurt to your ſide, to grant that the hole practiſe of the church hath runne with vs this . ix . hundreth yeares and thrée ſcore; where as, in poſſeſſion of landes, quiet poſſeſſion for the ſpace of one hundreth yeres or two, putteth yͤ caſe out of all doubte. You hange vpon the ſtate of the ſixe hundreth yeres, that were next after Chriſt, and you ſe how that the whole recorde of the ſtate runneth againſt you. Tertulian is againſt you: Ciprian is againſt you: Euſebius is againſt you: Ambroſe is againſt you: Cyrill is againſt you: The holy and aunciente counſell of Nyce is againſt you. And yet you will make the people to wéene, that all are with you

C. of that ſtate. I haue not brought in the emptie names, as Poticaries do vpon their dores, but haue ſhewed you what good drugges they haue. I haue not caſt out from the walle any vittayls in your auaile, to make a bragge in penurie, as many of your parte commonly vſe to do, as though they had greate plentie of vittailes, but haue brought you vnto the ſight of ſuche prouiſion, as the holy auncient fathers of the primatiue churche, ſuche as your ſelues do alowe, haue made for vs. But come vnto the practiſe of the churche, and recordes of the fathers, of the latter .ix. hundreth

D. yeres. They crie ſo thicke and threfolde againſt you, that you are not able to abide them. And therefore you were wonte to diſgrace them all. By what authoritie, I pray you, woulde you haue them all diſcredited? It ſauoreth of a maruellous arrogancie, to diſcredite them all. Can your doctrine cræpe no other wayes into credit, vnleſſe

leſſe you deface the practiſes of the churche, and the authoritée of the fathers, for the ſpace of .ix. hundreth yeres and odde? Haue you no other meanes to get honor, but to diſhonour ſo many auncient fathers, as haue written this latter .ix. hundred yeres? Know you not the ſcripture, *Qui maledixerit patri vel matri morte morietur.* And what malediction is there greater, then to blaſe that our learned fathers (that liued ſo godly in praiers, faſtynges, almeſdéedes continuall ſtudie of doctrine, that hath their common agréementes for the ſpace of .ix. hundred yeres and more) diſceiued Chriſtes flocke, knew not the right faieth, but trayned the people to the ſtate of dampnation? And I pray you, if they were ſo many yeres diſceiued, and yet giuen all the while to ſpiritual exerciſes, more then you, as it appereth by their workes, or any now a daies, what aſſurance can you make vs, that you do now know the truth? Beynge a man far vnderneth them in all poinctes? and one that hath not continued Here muche (as I here ſay) aboue fortie yeres, and not beſtowed the fourthe parte of that time neither (as I here) in ſtudie of the ſcriptures, or olde doctours? Shal you with .ix. or .x. yeres ſtudie in the matters of doctrine thinke your ſelfe able to ſit as a iudge, to controll all ſuch doctours, and the doctrine, whiche they haue left in recorde for the ſpace of .ix. hundred yeres? No man gaue you ſuch authoritée: but your ſelf. Luther, and Melancthon tooke vpon them to be reformers of religion in all poinctes. But if you marke them, they make no matter of neceſſitée to communicate the laytie with bothe kindes. They acknowledge that a general counſell may take ordre in it, as a thynge indifferent. And hauyng no ſcripture for the prouffe of the neceſſitée therof. They confirme alſo the being of chriſts body in a thouſand places at once, meanyng therin as the catholikes meane.

If you had acquainted your ſelf with Abraham and Iſaac, (that ſayed that quæcunq; promiſit deus, potens eſt & facere: What ſo euer God promiſeth, he is able to performe it. Or with the Angell that ſaied vnto Mary in as greate a mattier as this is, Non eſt impoſſibile apud deum omne verbum. There is no worde vnpoſſible vnto God :) as well as you haue acquainted your ſelfe with Iſmaell and Agar, that ſe no farther then the trade of common nature, or if you had marked, but the very rule of nature, how of an antecedent graũted, all neceſſarie conſequence do by force of reaſon iſſew there hence, you woulde neuer put the mattier in queſtion. Wée finde in ſcripture that our ſauiour ſaied in the conſecracion of the bleſſed ſacrament, *This is my bodie, that ſhall be deliuered for you.* And when the ſence of this ſentence is, as the catholike churche teacheth, the very reall pre-

R. Cap.

preſens of Chriſtes body to be in the bleſſed ſacramente : vpon this ſence, once ſetled, many labelles do neceſſarily hange: not expreſſedly had in ſcripture, but by drifte of reaſon out of the firſt veritie gathered. And ſo did ſaincte Chriſoſtome, S. Ambroſe, S. Baſill, and S. Bernard, when they vnderſtode the ſence of Chriſtes wordes concerning the conſecracion to be, as the holy catholike churche vnderſtode it. And not to haue powre in the parlour at Hieruſalem onely, where the ſacramēt was firſt inſtituted, but in all places, where the thinge was ſo practiſed, as Chriſt began it: Therunto they ſawe they muſte nédes confeſſe by drifte of argumente that Chriſtes body is in diuers places at once: and of the remainders of the accidentes, you néede no other proufe, but your owne ſenſis, your iye, and your taſtyng. And of the alteracion of the ſubſtance of breade, the fathers in diuers ages ſaw it ſo depende vpon the firſt veritie, that they haue omitted no varietie of termes, to expreſſe it and to brynge it into the knowledge of the worlde. They haue tranſmutation, tranſelementation, mutation, conuertion, faction, alteration, tranſſubſtanciation, and diuers other ſuch, that are not to be reherſed now. You haue taken vpō you to controll ẏ counſell of Conſtance alredie: but now you will controll the greate counſel of Lateran, where were ſo many learned clarkes, as there were neuer more gathered together. And the counſell of Valenſe, and the counſell of Rome, ſub Nicolao, and the generall counſell of Florence, and the counſell of Baſill. In the whiche all your errours, concernyng the holy ſacrament, are ouerthrowen. Concernyng your doubte how Chriſtes bodie is in diuers places at once, ſithen you beléeue no counſel that hath determined that mattier, nor auncient fathers, Grekes ne Latins, I will ſende you to your great god Luther, in a littell booke that he wrote againſt the Swinglians, of the ſence of the woordes of the ſupper of chriſte. They yet remayne vndefaced. There he anſwereth you at the ful: Or els to Brentius that great Cane, in the expoſition of the article of thaſſention in the firſt of the Actes: where he enterpreteth thereof at the full: thoughe very farre in diuers poinctes from the ſence of the churche. Yet may he not ſuffer that blinde reaſon of yours to haue his force in no caſe. It is but a very fonde daliance to braule vpon the labelles, before you agrée vpon the originall veritée. The trew ſence of this littell ſentence, *This is my body that ſhal be deliuered for you,* Is the roote and the originall of all ſuche labelles as wée teache, not mencioned in ſcripture expreſly, but bulted out by drifte of argument, as theſe are, that offend you ſo ſore. When the maiſter ſaieth to his ſeruaunt, make redie that I may dine: he

A ſimilitude for vnwrittē verities.

he ſpeaketh nothynge in theſe wordes of ſcommynge of the potte, of cleane water for the potage, of the earbes to be chopped, of ſcaldynge and drawynge the Capons, of makyng a fier, of hewyng of woodde, of laiyng the clothe, and other thynges neceſſarie belongyng to his dinner. And yet, if the ſeruaunt woulde leaue the potte vnſcommed, herbes vngathered, make potage with ſtinkyng water, put the Capon vpon ẏ broche, fethers, guttes and all, becauſe his maiſter made no expreſſe mencion of the particular orderyng of all theſe: I wéene no man woulde alow his wit or honeſtie. Becauſe in his maiſters firſt commaundement all ſuche neceſſaries are imploied. And ſo wée anſwer you as your mother the catholike churche hath taught vs. Wée néede not to ſhew you of accidentes, remainynge without any ſubiecte, nor of Chriſtes body being in diuers places at once, nor of the adoracion of the holy ſacrament, nor of many other trifling doubtes you make : becauſe all ſuch doubtes are anſwered to the ful,in the orygynall veritie of Chriſtes words,being in the nature of the veritee, neceſſarily imploied. As theſe are, agaynſte the whiche you may kicke, till you be wery: but it lieth not in you to alter the nature of Chriſtes owne wordes. If you had found in the ſcripture ſpoken by Chriſte concerninge the bleſſed ſacrament. This is not my body , but the figure of my body , beyng abſent in ſubſtance, and onely preſent to your imaginacions, by the ſight of the bread. You might haue triumphed and blowed vp your horne luſtely in euery pulpit, and made your auaunte, that you had bin able to controlle all chriſtendome. But now the letter is very playne againſt you, and the ſence of the letter alſo , as the fathers do recorde in all ages , and generall counſels to : As may appere by your owne miſtruſt for the ſpace of the laſt.ix.hundred yeres and odde. I take God to iudge, I wrote not this for any malice to ſuche as are otherwiſe bente: I pittie them rather, and dayly pray for them, that they may embrace the catholike faieth. But when I perceiued Golias in his brauerie, hauynge truſte in his bigge bones and ſtronge weapons, braggyng many times, as though there were none of the Iſraelites hable to matche him: Notwithſtandynge there are very many that coulde haue handled him better then I, beyng a man of ſmall learnyng, troubled with much buſineſſe: yet I thought it my dutie, for the honour of my mother the catholike churche, to hurle out foure or fiue ſtones in Dauids ſling againſt this champion: not to hurte him in the forhead, as Dauid did Golias, but to cruſhe in péeces certeine vntructhes that he taught. Wyſhyng him as wel to do as I woulde my ſelf: And all my countrey men of Englande to be ware, leaſt they fal into the ſnares and trappes that our ghoſtly enemie laieth abrode euery where : not onely to hurte their bodies, but to hurle downe bothe body and ſoule into the déepe dongeon of hell. The whiche I beſéeche God moſte hartely géeue all men grace to auoyde. Amen.

An Anſwere in defence of the truth. Againſte the Apologie of priuate Maſſe.

By Mr Cooper

LONDINI
Menſ. Nouēb.
1562.

The cheefe poinctes touched in this defence of the trueth.

Againſt priuate Maſſe, or ſoole receiuing by the miniſter in the common place of praier.

Why the doctours call the ſacrament of the Lordes ſupper by the name of oblacion or ſacrifice.

Againſt communion vnder one kinde.

Of reſeruacion of the ſacrament.

Againſt the argumentes of multitude and longe continuance of time.

Againſt the alledging of the auctoritee & name of the church.

What is to be attributed to the auncient fathers.

Of reall preſence and interpretacion of chriſtes wordes, Hoc eſt corpus. &c.

The preface to the Reader.

IT is wel knowen to a greate number, partly by preſence in hearinge, partely by wrytinge ſet forth of the ſame, that a worthy learned man and Biſhop of this Realme, ſtoutly in dede, as the matter required, and clerkly alſo, as learning and knowlage taught him, did openly proteſt in certaine Sarmons not to the furtheraunce of vntrueth, as malice carpeth, but to the confuſion of falſhodde, as the ende proueth: that, if any of thoſe things, which he then rehearſed, coulde be proued of the contrary ſide by any ſufficient aucthoritie of the ſcriptures, olde doctours and auntient councels, or by any alowed example of the primatiue church, then he would be contented to ſubſcribe, and yelde to their doctrine. This his doynge, as no leſſe was to be loked for, ſum men depraued, many diſpraiſed, all they miſliked, that mainteined ſuche ſuperſtitious errours, as falſe teachinge hath trained people in, the ſpace of certaine hundred yeares. And in dede, ſeinge they harde their doctrine ſo plainely defaced, and their wilfull miſleadynge of Chriſtian men ſo openly to be noted : a man maye thinke they had good cauſe to ſtartle at the matter, and ſomewhat to loke aboute them, leſte they ſeemed altogether careleſſe. Wherfore, as dyuers haue dyuerſly ſhewed theyr miſlikinge, ſo one of that partie hath in writing priuely ſpred abrode an anſwere to the forſaide offer or proteſtatiō for priuate maſſes: wherin he both perſwadeth him ſelfe, and would haue other alſo to beleue, that he hathe ſo fully ſatiſfied the parties requeſt, as it maye ſeeme greate folly, and as he termeth it, impudencie, any longer to ſtaye vpon it. One of the copies of this anſwere by occaſion, as it fortuned, not many monethes ſence lighted into my hands: which, I vnderſtande, is ſo ſpred abrode in dyuers places of this Realme, as there be fewe miſlikers of the trueth, but they haue it, and make ſuch accompte of it, as a greate number of the vnlearned ſorte ſtaie their conſciences there vpon. Who the aucthour is, or what maner of man, I neither knowe, nor can geſſe more, then he witneſſeth of him ſelfe in the entraunce of this treatiſe. Where he ſignifieth, that once he imbraced that religion, which he now deteſteth and writeth againſt. In that parte me thinketh he doth deale, as fonde men ſometime are wonte to doe: which to diſpleaſe their enemies, ſticke not to hurte them ſelues alſo. So he, to diſcredite the doctrine that he is reuolted from, geueth ſuch teſtimonie of his owne naughtie life and conſcience, as he would be lothe to heare at any mans mouth but his owne. All that time (ſaieth he) I neither regarded god, nor good relygion, nor any good conſcience beſide. What malice it is to charge the doctrine, that by hipocriſie he profeſſed, with the cauſe of his euill doinge, I will not declare with ſuche wordes, as the matter requireth. This muche I will ſaye, that he learned this of olde Adams greate councellour: Who at the beginninge, beinge blamed for his diſobedyence, ſeemed to bourden God him ſelfe with the cauſe of it: and excuſed his owne folly by that thinge, whiche his maker had geuen him to his comforte and commoditie. In like manner, when this mans conſcience, as it ſeemeth by hys owne wordes, accuſed him of lewde liuinge and lacke of the feare of god, to excuſe his owne ill diſpoſed minde, he caſteth the faute vpon the doctrine of the goſpell, whiche God did open vnto him vndoubtedly to his great commoditie, if he would haue taken it. And vnder this pretence, bothe forſaketh it him ſelfe, and by his example exhorteth other to eſchew it. But as the wicked life of a man, to his owne greate harme, may be a blotte to the religion, that he profeſſeth: ſo God forbidde it ſhould be compted a full reprofe of the ſame, or a iuſte cauſe to be of all other reiected. If it were ſo, men ſhould refuſe Chriſtianitie, becauſe dyuers, not of the baſeſt ſorte, but of the heades of the Churche, as their owne hiſtories witnes, haue ben of horrible and wycked life. But we muſte thinke, that the hipocriſie and tratterous couetouſnes of Iudas and his felowes is a confuſion to them ſelfe, but no iuſt reproche to Chriſte that they folow, or to his doctrine that they ſeeme to profeſſe. I will iudge and hope better of this wryter, to whom with all my harte I wiſhe much more good: truſtinge that god ſhall once agayne open his hearte to receiue the trueth, which I cannot but thinke God hathe taken from him in puniſhment of that naughtie conſcience, that hee witneſſeth hath ben in him ſelfe. But, what ſoeuer he be, let him ſtande or fall to his lorde god, I will not take vppon mee to iudge him, neither would I haue ſpoken this much of him, but that hee doeth odiouſly excuſe his owne euill mynde by the good doctrine of Chriſtes goſpel. My purpoſe is to confute his doctrine, I wil not meddle with his perſon. I intende to anſwere his cauelinge at other mens wordes and doinges: I minde not to diſcredite or deface his eſtimation or honeſtie. And yet in this pointe I know ſome maye iudge me preſumptuous and arrogant, that I ſeeme to take vppon me his quarell, who is farre better able to aunſwere for him ſelfe then I am. But I would deſire thoſe, whiche ſo thinke, to conſider: Firſte, that this is a common quarell, touchinge not only him, that is named, but all other that either teacheth or beleueth as he doth. Secondly, that he againſt whom this writing is directed, either knoweth not that any ſuch thinge is ſpred, or if he doe know it, either thinketh it not worthy anſwere of it ſelfe, or els hath not at this preſent ſuch leaſure, as he may intend to anſwere it. Thirdly and chiefely, that by priuate conference with certaine perſons, I vnderſtande, perhappes more then either he or any other doth thinke, how much this treatiſe is eſtemed amonge many, which otherwiſe happely mighte bee perſwaded to imbrace the goſpell. Therefore I haue bene moued the ſoner my ſelfe, in ſuche ſorte as I might, to ſhape an aunſwere vnto it. For, to all ſuche of the contrary opinion, as haue feare of God, and ſtaye vpon conſcience rather then ſelfe wil, I acknowlage my ſelf in chriſtian charitie to owe this muche of dutie, as that I ſhould, to my power, trauaile to lift this ſtumbling blocke out of theyr way, that it maye not be a let or ſtaie vnto them to come vnto Chriſte, at this daye by his worde callinge them. Wherfore gentle Reader, ſeing thou doeſt vnderſtand my meaning and the occaſion of my doinge, I will ceaſe any more to trouble thee, and will tourne the reſidew of my talke vnto the aucthour of this wryting: with whom I will make my entrie there, where he firſt beginneth to confute the reaſons, that were alleged, why accompte ſhould not bee made to Doctor Cole of that religion that now is taught. In this parte I wil be the ſhorter, partly becauſe thoſe thinges bee ſufficiently anſwered in the conference already publiſhed, althoughe this wryter ſeemeth to diſſemble it: partly, becauſe the queſtions haue more captiouſnes of wordes then profit of good matter.

The defence of the truth.

1. Cap.

Where you reaſon againſte my lorde of Saleſburée, for refuſinge to bringe proufe of his doctrin becauſe he was a Biſhop, and at that time preached before the Quéenes grace and hir counſel: You deale ſomewhat like with him, as you doo afterwarde with the Doctours that you doo alledge. For you firſt bring your owne ſence vnto their wordes, and ſo alledge them for your purpoſe, where as they meane nothynge leſſe. So in the wordes of the firſte epiſtle to Doctor Cole you applie your owne ſence vnto them, and after reaſon againſt it, as though it were his meanyng. Whether this be to be compted a cauilling, rather then a confutyng, I leaue to the iudgement of o-

A. ther. He neuer ſayde ſimply, that he ſhould make no recknynge of his doctrine, becauſe he was a biſhop. For he doeth the contrarie dayly aſwell in his preachinge as otherwiſe. He neuer ſaide that the conſent of the prince and realme was a ſufficient proufe of doctrine in chriſtian religiō, as you would haue men thinke of him by your reaſonyng againſt him. He ſayd this, that, for ſo muche as he was called to the ſtate of a biſhop, and at that time vttered before the prince and hir counſell that doctrine, which was confirmed by the authoritée of the whole realme: he might ſéeme to doo vnaduiſedly, if he ſhoulde make accompte therof to a ſubiecte, and eſpecially ſuche a ſubiecte as alway hath profeſſed him ſelfe to miſlike it, and at that time, vnder pretence of learnyng, but in déede quarellyng, required a proufe therof. Were it góod reaſon thinke you, that a magiſtrate at the demaunde of euery ſubiect

A iuſte cauſe of his refuſall.

ſhould bryng reaſon to proue any law publiſſhed by the prince to bee good, which the ſame ſubiecte would proteſte to be an euill and vniuſt law, and therfore woulde not obey it? If that ſhould be ſo, a gappe might be opened to euerie buſie perſon to picke a quarell againſt the law. If that ſhould be ſo, beſide other inconueniences, he might ſeeme to ſubmit the iudgement of the prince and realme to the miſlikynge of one waywarde ſubiecte. Which coulde not be doone without greate impeachement to the princes authoritee, and wiſedome of the whole ſtate of the cōmon weale. That this was his meanyng, it may appere in thoſe wordes, where he ſaith he might not doo it without farther licence. Wherfore in this parte of his anſwere, knowyng with whome he had to doo, he reſpected his doctrine, as it was a law confirmed by the prince and ſtates of the realme: and not as it might be a controuerſie of religion before the law publiſſhed. More ouer in that he is orderly called to the ſtate of a biſſhop (ſay you what you wil to the contrarie,) he is in poſſeſſion of the trueth: And therefore it were not reaſon, that he ſhould be requeſted firſt to ſhew his euidence and take vpon him the perſon of the plaintife: eſpecially towarde thoſe men that make exception to his poſſeſſion, and claime the right therof them ſelues. He ought not lightly to geue ouer to you in this poincte: he ought to acknowledge and ſtande in defence of that benefit, wherby, through gods worde and aucthoritée of the prince, he is ſette in open poſſeſſion of that, which you before vſurped. Séeyng then it is the plaintifes parte firſt to ſhew euidence, and he now (god be thanked) ſtandeth with other as defendante: You doo diſorderly and contrarie to reaſon to will him to doo that, which by order your ſelfe ſhoulde firſt doo. He profered openly to geue ouer to you, if you coulde ſhew any reaſonable euidence for your part out of the ſcriptures, doctours, or counſels: If you refuſe it, all men will thinke, that either you haue no euidence at all to ſhew, or els that, whiche you haue, is ſuche, as you are well aſſured wyll not abide the triall.

B. In like maner do you miſtake his reſtyng vpon the negatiue. You write not againſt his meanyng, but againſt that your ſelfe conceiueth to be in his wordes. He ſayde not abſolutely no negatiue propoſition coulde be proued, neither doeth D. Cole finde ſo muche faute with him for deniyng that a negatiue might be proued (for him ſelfe had ſo ſaide before) but with this, that, to gréeue his aduerſarie he woulde ſtay vpon the negatiue, and put you of the contrarie parte to proue the affirmatiue. Whiche was vpon good reaſon donne at that time, to the ende, as I thinke, that he might preſſe vpon you ſomwhat narre, then other

before

The cauſe why hee might iuſtly reſt vpon the negatiue.

before had vſed to doo. For whereas you haue vntruly borne the worlde in hande, and make your auaunte continually, that the church hath taught as you doo theſe. xv. hundred yeres, that the holy ſcriptures, auenciente fathers & counſels doo make altogether for your doctrine & againſt ours: he both wiſely and learnedly did ſée, that there was no way ſo fitte either to driue you from this auaunte, or to declare it euidently to be falſe, as to reſt vpon this true negatiue, that you haue no ſufficiente proufe out of the authoritées before rehearſed. For therby he ſhould either force you to ſhew what you haue, whiche in effecte is nothynge, or els to confeſſe that the chiefe poinctes of your doctrine by him recited be, as they are in déede, cleane beſide the wordes of god and example of the primatiue churche: or, if you would not for ſhame confeſſe it, yet that all men in the ende might perceiue it is ſo, when that you neither

would

woulde nor coulde bring any ſufficient confirmation of the ſame , by the ſcriptures,olde fathers,auncient counſels, or alowed example of the church by the ſpace of . vi . hundred yeres . I will declare the mattier by example of thoſe thinges, that your ſelf taketh in hande to proue. All the preachers of this time teache,that the right vſe of the lordes ſupper is to be celebrated in maner of a communion or feaſt with companie, and that as well the laytée as clergy ſhoulde receiue vnder bothe kindes.

This doctrine they ſay is accordyng to Gods worde and vſe of the primatiue churche and not the contrarie . For proufe thereof they alledge out of the ſcripture the Euangeliſtes and ſaincte Paule, in whiche appereth euidently that company was,and bothe kindes were indifferently vſed , and no ſignification at all of the contrarie : For the primatiue churche they bringe Iuſtine, Dyoniſius,Cyprian,Chriſoſtome and other declaringe in plaine woꝛdes the vſe of their time to haue bene ſo: and affirme that the ſame auncient fathers neuer make any euydente mencion, that the contrarie maner was vſed and alowed in the common adminiſtration of the Sacramente. Contrariwyſe you on the other parte affirme that the pꝛieſte in middes of the congregacion maye commonlie conſecrate and receiue alone, and that the laitée in the Communion ſhould receiue only the bꝛeade and not the cuppe of the Loꝛde. This doctrine, ſay you, is accoꝛdinge to the ſcripture and example of the olde churche: and they that will ſay the contrarie, you compte and vſe as heretikes. But when they call vpon you to ſhewe ſome ſufficient pꝛoſe thereof out of the Scripture and doctours, you refuſe it, cauelling and biddinge them pꝛoue the contrarie. Which is alway the ſhifte of them that haue nothinge to ſaye. This is the negatiue, that was ſtayed vpon, that you are not able to proue by the ſcripture or fathers, that euer the prieſte vſed in the Churche to celebrate alone, as you doo in priuate maſſe, or that the people in Communion was commonly ſerued with the breade only, and not with the cuppe: and you wold haue him to proue this negatiue. As if you ſhould ſaye vnto him, ſir doo you proue that we be not able to bring any ſufficient teſtimony out of the fathers. Surely the profe of this negatiue can bée none other, but to holde open the bookes of the bible and doctours to you, and wyll you to reade them ouer, and ſée that there is no ſuche profe for your parte. If any of your parte ſhould ſay to one of vs, as you doo in your writinge, that no ſentence in all the ſcripture doeth iuſtifie that we doo herein teache, and the party to whom it is ſpoken would wyll you to proue it: would you not thinke hée did vnlearnedly? would you not thinke that eyther hée did of purpoſe ſéeke a ſhifte to cauille, or els in déede had nothinge to ſaye: Or if you do thinke it reaſonable, I will learne at your hande howe you coulde proue that negatiue by all your lawe or logike: I do ſcante thinke you wyl ſay that a man may be orderly required to proue ſuche mere negatiues. When a negatiue or what kinde of negatiues may bée proued, I leaue to bée diſcuſſed in ſome other place, as a queſtion more mete for Sophiſters in the paruiſe ſchoole at Oxforde, then for dyuines in matters of weight and importance.

2. Cap.

An aunſwere to the diſtinction of priuate

After your reaſoninge againſte the cauſes, that, as you ſaye, were alleged not to proue the negatiue, as it were to lay the ground of your controuerſée for priuate maſſes, ye beginne with a diſtinction, that this terme priuate may be taken after diuers ſortes: Eyther as contrary to common to many for the commoditie therof, or els as ſole

A. receiuing by a prieſt alone without any company. In the firſte way, you ſaye ye neuer affirmed maſſe to be priuate, but to pertaine to the behalfe of all ſtates and ſortes of men, whatſoeuer they be. In deede I were to blame and very iniurious vnto you, if I woulde denie, that ye haue ben very bountifull in beſtowinge the benefite of your maſſe: and eſpecially when money was broughte in aboundantly. For then ye applied it vnto highe, to low; to Princes, to priuate perſons, to abſent, to preſents to quicke, to deade: to heauen, to hel, yo and to purgatory to: Ouer and beſide that ye made it a ſalue for all ſores, and a remedy for all miſcheffes. Here were a large feeld for me to deſcant vpon the diuers abuſes, that you applied it vnto, contrary to Chriſtes inſtitution and ordinaunce: but that any Chriſtian hart may rather yerne and lamente to remember ſo vngodly prophanation of the holy Sacrament, then to ſeeke occaſion pleaſantly to daly in the rehersall and deluding of the infinite vanyties therof. A The other ſignification of priuate in ſole receiuing by the prieſt, not imbarringe any that is willynge and ready to be partaker with him, ye ſay the Catholike Church doth and alway hath taught. And here vpon makinge your propoſition, ye require a profe of the affirmatiue included in the negatiue: that is, that euery prieſt or any other ought, when he receiueth, to haue a company to receiue with hym. Why ſir, is this the truſte that you would ſéeme to haue in the trueth of your cauſe? is this the plaine and ſound dealinge, that ye after profeſſe to vſe? is this the leauing of all ſhifts, where by ye may ſéeme to cauill, rather then ſtaye vppon the chéefe profes of your matter? Who ſéeth not that euen in the very entrance, miſtruſtinge your quarel, ye ſeke a ſhifte as it were by policy to helpe that, whiche in the open féelde is not able to defende it ſelfe ? This was no parte of the challinge (as you terme it). This is not that ye pretende ſo earneſtly to proue . The matter is of priuate maſſes , and you make your iſſue in ſole receiuing . Is there no difference, thinke you, betwene ſole receiuinge and priuate maſſe ? doeth euery one, that receiueth alone , ſay a priuate maſſe? Then may not only prieſtes ſay maſſe , but alſo by your owne authorities after brought in, lay men and women alſo . And yet your reaſoninge in the reſidew of your treatiſe is ſuche, as if it were a ſufficiente profe of priuate maſſe to ſhew, that ſome men and women in certaine caſes receiued alone in the primatiue Church. But of your argumentes afterwarde. In this place ye ſhall geue me leaue to finde that faute in you , that *Tully* in the beginning of his offices layeth to *Panetius*: who , intending to write of dutie in behauiour, omitteth the definition of the ſame :

where as euery reaſonable diſcourſe ought to procede of a briefe declaracion of that, whiche is in controuerſie. If ye had this done, I doubte not but ye would rather haue plucked your pen from the paper, then haue medled with the matter, that ye are now entred into. I will therefore ſhewe you out of your owne authours, what I take your priuate maſſe to bee. It is a ſacrifice of the body and bloud of Chriſt vſed in the Churche in place of the Lordes Supper, by one prieſte alone offered to God the father for the ſinnes of quicke and deade: which, without any to participate with him, he may apply to the benefite of what perſons and thinges hee liketh. That it is a ſacrifice of Chriſtes body, that it is vſed in place of the Lordes Supper, that one may offer it for quicke and deade, that it is in the prieſtes power to apply it, all your ſorte doe not only without reſiſtance ſafely confeſſe, but without reaſon

What priuat maſſe is.

B.

ſtoutly defende . Therefore I ſhall not neede to make any further proufe of the partes of this diſcription . I doo therefore take priuate maſſe to be, not only as you and ſome other patrons of your cauſe of late yeares haue wreſted it, ſence the miniſters of gods trueth in this latter time haue driuen you to the beſt ſhiftes of interpretacion : but as it was commonly vſed in the worlde before, and as it is ſet forth in your ſcholemen to the great defacinge of Chriſtes death and paſſion . And yet ye ſhall not thinke that wee of trueth can or ought to yelde to the beſt of your interpretacions that euer I could heare. Of this priuate maſſe that I haue nowe declared to you, the challenge, that ye take ſo greuouſly, was made ? And therein doo I alſo at this time ioigne iſſue with you, and ſay, that neither you nor any of your parte will euer be able to proue the ſame by the holy ſcriptures , auncient fathers, or alowed councels: yea and becauſe you vrge the negatiue, that, with gods healpe, wée will abundantly proue the contrary. This will I do quietly and calmely, without ſtormynge or tempeſtuous bluſtering either at you or at your doctrine: as one moſte glad to bringe you againe to that heauenly trueth of the goſpel: whiche, vnder the blaſphemous names of falſhode and phantaſée, you declare your ſelfe to haue forſaken.

3. Cap. In the reſidue of your diſcourſe ye woulde ſéeme to take from vs the true and right rule to reforme the church of Chriſt, that is, to proue that in doctrines and vſe of the ſacramentes al thinges ſhould not be reduced to the patern of the Apoſtles time and the primatiue churche. Herein you doo as they are wonte, whoſe conſcience doeth pricke them to haue done amiſſe. For ſuche alway draw backe and lurke out of the light; being lothe to come there, where they know that truth woulde be tried.

Euen ſo you, fearyng to be founde fautie, woulde wryng vs from that rule, wherby all trueth in doctrine ought to be examined. To this purpoſe ye may ſeeme to bryng three reaſons. One is a rowlyng in of a rable of ſuche examples as no reaſonable man woulde denie vnto you. The ſeconde is a reſemblyng of the primatiue church vnto an infant in the ſwadlynge cloutes: and this latter time to a tall man of perfit yeres and ripe age. The thirde is the compariſon of the times and the feruēt charitee that then was, with the keycolde charitee that now is. As touching the firſt, I cannot choſe but greately merueile at your maner of reaſonyng: whiche indeuour to proue the contrary of that, that no man did euer affirme. Did ye euer here of any, that woulde A. haue all thinges without exception reduced to that very forme of the worldes, that was in the primatiue churche? And yet your examples tendeth to the proufe of nothyng els. But you pleaſed your ſelf ſo trimly in the deuiſe of thoſe pretie tauntes and odious ſuſpitions: as you woulde rather proue that no man denied, then leaue them out of your writyng. Your minde was by like to make the worlde thinke: that wee purpoſed, vnder colour of reformacion, to brynge all thinges in common, to ſuppreſſe chriſtian princes, to pull temporalties from biſſhops: to make men forbeare ſtifled meates, to brynge infantes againe to communion. &c. If ye thought it to be true, ye were wickedly perſwaded: if ye did not thinke it, ye did maliciouſly to write it. As for kinges and princes wee muſt leaue to the gouernment of gods prouidence, and cōmon weales to be ruled by their good and holſome lawes. For the teachyng of the Goſpell taketh not away ciuill order and policie. But religion, whiche is the worſhyppynge of God, muſt be examined chiefly by the worde of God, appoincted to be the very touchſtone therof , partly alſo by the ſtate of that time, whiche, in all reaſon , may ſeme to be fartheſt from corruption. Herein are to be conſidered twoo kinde of thinges, truth of doctrines, and right vſe of the ſacramentes , as thinges in the churche moſte neceſſarie : rites and ceremonies for orders ſake, as thynges meane and indifferent. In doctrine there is but one veritie, and but one right vſe of the ſacramentes. Therfore they ſhould be alwaies one at al times, and then are moſte likely to be leaſte corrupted, when thei are nigheſt yͤ time they were firſt ordeined in. As for ceremonies they may by diſcretion be altered, as perſon, place, ſtate of time and other circumſtances ſhal geue occaſion. For the vſe of ceremonies therfore and thinges indifferente, wee do not binde you to the Apoſtles time and the primatiue churche. But if the vſe of the ſacramentes be either by ignorance cor-

what thinges ought to be reformed to the ſtate of the primatiue churche, & why rupted, either with falſe opinions, depraued, or with ſuperſtitious ceremonies defaced, is it not full time thinke you to call for redreſſe accordyng to the ſcripture and primatiue churche? So to doo wee haue good example in Chriſte him ſelfe, and in his apoſtle S. Paule. When Chriſte woulde purge the lawe from phariſaicall mitigations, and interpretacions, he had recourſe to ẏ firſt fountaine & originall: ſaiynge, *Dictum eſt veteribus, &c. Ego autem dico vobis,* So he ruduced all to the firſt fountaine. In ẏ matter of deuorſemēt he alledged not the Rabins and late writers of Jewes: but ſaied, *Ab initio non fuit ſic.* Countyng what ſoeuer was added to the firſt ordinance of the lawe to be a corruption of it. S. Paule myndyng to redreſſe the abuſe of this ſacramente of the lordes ſupper, euen in this pointe, that they toke it in partes and not together, bryngeth the inſtitution of Chriſt from the beginnyng and ſaieth: This haue I

Math. 5.

receiued of the Lorde. Wyllynge to alter nothyng therin. The like doeth S. *Cyprian epiſt.* ad Cecilium, againſt Aquarios. Wee muſt not harken (ſaieth he) what other did before vs, but what Chriſte firſt did, that was before al. And here he ſpeaketh of the ſame ſacrament, and againſt them that abuſed it contrarie to the firſt foūdacion were they neuer ſo holy. This, *Tertullian* alſo taketh to be a ſure rule againſt all hereſies and abuſes, who ſaith in this wiſe, This reaſon is of force againſt all hereſies. That is true, that was firſt ordeined, & that is corrupted, that is after done. And Cyprian in the ſame epiſtle before mencioned. Hereof (ſaith he) ariſe diuiſions in the church, becauſe wee ſeeke not to the head, nor haue recourſe to the fountaine, nor kepe the commaundementes of the heauenly maiſter. Therefore, ſeyng it is ſo good a rule in religion to reſorte to the firſt inſtitucion, wee alſo without any iuſt reproche may require to haue the ſacramentes reformed, accordynge to the ſcripture and the primatiue church.

But you thinke perhappes, although foꝛ ſhame ye may not ſay it, that their ſucceſſours in elder age of the churche, were of moꝛe wiſedome and diſcretion, and knewe better what they had to do, then the Apoſtles and olde fathers. Therto tendeth your ſimilitude of bꝛingyng a talle man againe to his ſwadlyng cloutes: therein reſemblynge the pꝛimatiue churche to infancie, and this latter time to ripe age and diſcretion. B

That the pꝛimatiue churche was not of the ſtate of infancie.

This is not your onely ſimilitude: It is muche in the mouthes of ſuche as mainteine your doctrine. But, I aſſure you, it was neuer inuented without the ſpirite of Antichꝛiſte: noꝛ cannot be mainteined without blaſphemy againſt Chꝛiſte, and ſingular repꝛoche of his Apoſtles and their ſucceſſours. If that time were the ſtate of infancie in the churche, when Chꝛiſt him ſelfe inſtructed, when his Apoſtles taught, when the holy fathers gouerned nexte their time: then we muſte nedes recken

Chriſt, the Apoſtles, the fathers, to be infantes in religion, to be babes in gouernement of the churche, not to be able ſo well to ſe what was conueniente in the vſe of the ſacramente, as their poſteritæ were. Can any chriſtian mans hearte fall into that cogitacion without feare of Gods wrath and diſpleaſure? And yet that muſt nædes folow vpon this defence of your doctrine. I pray you, when hath a man beſt diſcrecion to rule him ſelfe? Will yée not ſay, when he is moſt indued with the vſe of reaſon and wiſedome? When had the churche of God ſuch aboundant wiſedome and knowledge of his heauenly miſteries? When was it indued with ſo plentifull graces of the holy ghoſt, as it was in time of the Apoſtles and firſt fathers? Did it not appere in their pure life, in their feruent zeale, in their miraculous workyng? And will you then to defende your ceremonies affirme that time to be the ſtate of infancie in the churche? Do you not remember, that immediatly after ye attribute to the primatiue church paſſing feruent charitee, with exceedyng holyneſſe of life, & contempte of the worlde? To this latter time keycolde charitee, ſlacke deuocion, loue of the worlde, and contempte of vertue? Whereof I pray you commeth this? Not becauſe in the firſte time they were ſtronge in godlynes, abundante in liuely ſpirite and grace of God? and wee now feeble and fainte to all vertuous doinge, lackinge wiſedome, and as it were dotinge for age? For what other cauſe was yonge age of children called infancie, then for that it had not the vſe of the tonge, nor coulde not ſpeake? But the primatiue Church coulde ſpeake, and continually declare the good will of God and his great benefites to his people. S. Paule ſpake with a loude voice and a ſtronge ſpirite: *Woe be to me, if I preache not the goſpell.* The ſame was the voice of all the olde fathers and godly men in the beginning. They were occupied in nothinge but either in teaching and confirminge truth, or in reprouinge and defacinge falſhode and hereſie: but after.600.yeres the prelates of the churche wel nere cleane loſte their voyces. Wealth of the worlde, honour and ryches had ſtopped their mouthes in ſuch ſorte, that within few yeres it came to paſſe, that it was a rare matter, and almoſte a reproche, to ſee a biſhoppe in the pulpite, and heare him ſpeake to the people. Wherefore ye can not ſo aptly reſemble the primatiue churche to infancie, as ye may this latter time to dotinge olde age: wherin they that ſhould do nothinge but preache the worde of God and teache the people, haue either cleane loſte the vſe of their ſpeache throughe infancie and ignorance, or els bable they wot not what, through dotage and follie: That ye may not thinke me to ſpeake of ſto-

C.
An aunſwere to the comparison of this time, with the primatiue churche.

make more then trueth, reade the hiſtories of this latter time, rede thoſe that write particularly of the Biſhoppes of Rome, ſée howe many bée praiſed for preachinge to the people and for teachinge the worde of god, either by ſpeakinge or writinge. So that they may not only ſéeme for age to haue loſte the ſtrength of their voice, but as it were with a paulſie to haue loſte the vſe of their handes, onles it weare in wrytinge of decrées or fingringe of pence.

C. An aunſwere to the compariſon of this time, with the primatiue churche.

In that ye attribute vnto the primatiue Churche ſo good deuotion, ſo earneſt zeale, ſo feruente charitée, and there by that they came dayly to the receiuing of the Sacrament: it is moſt true that ye ſay. But you muſt againe conſider, that the often frequenting of the Lordes Supper, by grace therein conferred, did bothe bréede and increaſe that ſame liuely faith and feruent charitée, that in mutuall loue and contempte of the worlde ſo flouriſhingly did ſhewe it ſelfe in them. So that their earneſt zeale dyd not ſo muche cauſe them to come often to the Lordes Supper, as the often frequenting therof did increaſe their ſo greate zeale and charitee. For by that meanes it was alwayes freſhe in their memory, not only by hearinge, but alſo by feeling in them ſelfe, that they were all members of one body, all the children of one father, all deliuered oute of bondage by one raunſome, all fed with one foode, and noriſhed at one table. And therefore that it was as meete and neceſſary for them to imbrace one another, as for one limme of the body to healpe another: for one brother to loue another: one deliuered oute of thraldome to reioyce with the other: One houſholde companion to tender the good eſtate of the other. Therfore that kaycolde charitee, that you ſay, and truly ſay, doeth reigne in theſe dayes, may not more iuſtly bee attributed to any one thinge,

then

Colde charitie is not ſo muche cauſe of priuate maſſe, as priuate maſſe is of colde charitie.

then to your priuate maſſe. For there by the common vſe and frequentation of the holy Sacramente of vnitie, loue, and concorde, hath bene taken from amonge the people of God: beinge perſwaded by you, that it was ſufficient for them to bee preſent in the churche, when one of you alone dyd ſaye a priuate maſſe. You laye the cauſe of priuate maſſe vpon the keicolde charitee of the people: (and perhappes the firſt occaſion came therof in deede) but your ſcalding hotte and firebourning charitee may bee more iuſtly charged with the continuance thereof. And therfore the people of God may worthely crie out vpon the chiefe maiſters and mainteiners of it: for all the miſchiefe and diueliſhnes either in naughtines of life, or corruption of doctrine, that the Churche hath ben drowned in this certaine hundred yeres, may ſeeme to be drawen in firſte by that occaſion. Haſten you (ſaith Ignatius) to the ſacrament of thankes geuinge and to the glory of god. For when that is continually frequented, all the powers of the deuil are expelled. Then muſte it of neceſſitée be, that the ſlacke vſe of the ſame doth bringe in weakenes of faith, coldneſſe of charitée, contempte of vertue, loue of the worlde, and the hole heape of thoſe things that the deuill moſte deſireth and chiefely ſheweth his power in. Therefore, not without a cauſe, that perpetual enemy of mankinde quickely did ſéeke occaſion euen in S. Paules time to corrupt the right vſe of this Sacrament, and bring them to factions in receiuinge of it. He did wel ſée of how greate force it was to mainteine concorde, loue, and charitée: which is, as it weare, the very cogniſance of a Chriſtian man. For that cauſe hee indeuoringe, as hee doeth alway traiterouſly to traine away the ſeruauntes of God: firſte alway by the abuſe of this Sacramente of vnitie, he, as it weare, cutteth of the cogniſance from their liueries: that, not beinge knowen whoſe Souldiours they are, he may the ſooner conueigh them into his campe, and there put on his badge of hatred, malice, & diſſencion. Your faute therfore in furtheryng his indeuour cannot be excuſed: But is to be taken of Chriſtian people as very greeuous and heinous. But ye wil ſay, that the prieſt doeth not imbarre any that will communicate: that he wolde reioyſe to ſe them diſpoſe them ſelues vnto it: that they doo lament to ſe the contrarie. Theſe be faire wordes without any ſounde trueth at all. I aſſure you ſir, if the matter were ſo indeede vnfeinedly, & not you by force of truth againſt you driuen to ſeeke that interpretacion for a ſhifte, your ſoole receiuyng had ben muche more tollerable.

An obiection.

The aunſwere.

But when I pray you did any of you vſe in priuate maſſes to cal for the people: to reproue their ſlacknes: to ſhew them the daunger of beyng preſente and not receiuyng: to tell them of the greate commoditees that commeth by the vſe of it? When did any of you ſtande at the aulter as Chriſoſtom did, and crie for the people to be partakers: declaryng to them, that, in being preſent at this heauenly feaſt as gaſers and no receiuers, they did runne into the indignation and diſpleaſure of god: euen as they, whiche, beyng bidde of a prince to a feaſt, and commynge into the houſe where tables be laied and furniſſhed with meate, will ſtande lokyng on and eate none of it, muſte of neceſſitee greatly diſpleaſe that prince, whoſe prouiſion and furniture they do ſo diſgrace. When (I ſay) did any of you folowe his example, whom vniuſtly ye bringe for defence of your errour? Is not the whole maner of your Maſſe contrarie to this? Do you not turne from the people? Do you not whiſper ſoftly to your ſelfe? Do you not vſe a ſtrange language, that neither the people, neither the prieſtes ſometime do vnderſtande? Do you not perſwade them, that they may haue the benefit of it, though they receiue not the ſacrament? Chriſoſtome proueth and other doctours witneſſeth, that thoſe, that be preſent and not receiue, do wickedly and impudently: and you teache that, beyng preſente and not receiuynge, they do holily and godly. If this be not to teache contrarie to the fathers and to the primatiue church I can not tell what may be contrarie. To conclude therfore, if the people be ſlacke and not wel diſpoſed to frequentyng of the ſacramente, the faute is in you. And you, whoſe duitie it was to warne and inſtructe them, ſhall make accompte for their decay and periſhing in their negligence. But the effecte of your argument, wherein ye alledge the colde charitie of the people, there by to driue vs neceſſarely to graunte ſole receiuinge, tendeth to this ende: if their deuotion be ſo little, as they wyll not with callinge and exhortation diſpoſe theim ſelfe to receiue, wheather then wee will (as your phraſe is) pull the prieſte from the aulter. Firſte, acknowlage and amende that faute of your maſſe, wherin appereth neither callinge and exhortation, nor geſture and language fitte for that purpoſe. Then, I ſay it weare better not only to plucke him from the aulter, but alſo to caſte him out of the Churche to, rather then hee ſhould vnder that pretence both him ſelfe continually alter the inſtitution of Chriſte, and alſo cauſe the people being preſent, by Chriſoſtomes witnes, to renne into gods diſpleaſure. Moreouer this keycolde charitee, that ye ſay the peoples heartes be froſen with, doth it ſtretche vnto prieſtes or no? Is their deuotion any hotter? ſurely their bourninge zeale, that of late time they haue vſed, proueth, and their hole behauiour to the worlde witneſ- D.

ſeth, that right deuotion and true charitie is euen as little amonge your maſſinge prieſtes, as among the ignorante people. How happeneth then, that they do ſo often frequent the Sacrament in theſe daies? There were neuer halfe ſo many Maſſes (though ye take Maſſe for the cōmunion) as there is in this time. Ye ſhall neuer reade in the primatiue churche that they had more then one celebracion in a day: onleſſe the churche were ſo littell, that it would not receiue the communicantes. (As Leo in a certaine epiſtle mencioneth.) But in your churches ye haue ſometime. xx. or . xxx. and yet not twoo communicantes at any of them. Yée muſt then confeſſe either a greate and horrible abuſe of the ſacrament: or els that your prieſtes deuocion nowe is muche mor then in ỹ primatiue church.

R. But ye obiecte that prieſtes are bounden of duitie to the daily frequentacion of it, and the people lefte frée. That woulde I faine learne at your hande, and ſe ſome good proufe of the ſcripture for the ſame. But I anſwer that you, whiche ſay wee haue no colour of ſcripture for that wee herein defende, haue leſſe then a light ſhadow to hide your falſe aſſercion in: and that in this ye ſpeake cleane beſide the worde of god. Chriſtes inſtitucion was generall, and his commaundement therin ſtretcheth as well to the people as to the prieſtes. *Take, eate, drinke you all of this, doo this in remembrance of me*, bindeth the people as wel as the prieſtes. That ye may not replie, that all whiche were preſente were prieſtes, becauſe they weare apoſtles, and ſo applie the ſacrament vnto prieſtes of neceſſitee, and to the people vpon free pleaſure: Vnderſtande you that S. Paule, a good interpretour of Chriſtes minde, applieth the ſame to the whole congregacion of Corinth: where, it is certaine, were both miniſters and common people. As for the

vnitie

duttie of miniſtracion , whereby perhappes ye thinke prieſtes more bounden : Ye ſhoulde not attribute more to the prieſt miniſtrynge, then to Chriſte miniſtring. But Chriſt toke the bread, gaue thankes, brake it, gaue it to them preſent, willed them therin to remember his death : Then the prieſt in his miniſtracion muſte doo as Chriſte did, and no otherwiſe: that is to take, geue thankes, breake & geue vnto the people. But why ſhould he breake it, or howe ſhould he diſtribute it, if there be none preſente to receiue it . So that hereon I conclude the prieſt is not bounde to miniſter, if there be none to receiue.

If wee had no ſcripture at all to proue that the prieſt ſhould not receiue without company : If ye did geue vs the ouerthrow in that: yet coulde ye not triumphe therin, as though ye had wonne the filde . It weare but the ſhiftinge backe of one winge of the battayle, whiche ye might ouerthrow ; and yet miſſe of your purpoſe. Our contention is for priuate maſſe, and your purpoſe is to proue your vſe of priuate maſſe to be good: of which ſole receiuinge is but one parte: and yet haue not ſufficiently concluded that neither. For it foloweth not to ſay, the prieſte in caſe of neceſſitie, when none wil receiue, may take the Sacrament alone: Therefore he may do it without neceſſitie, when hee may haue other to communicate with him. Do you neuer receiue alone in your maſſe, but ye bee dryuen for lacke of other? How happeneth then, that in one churche ye ſhal haue at one time. vi. or. viii. maſſing in ſundry corners, where they might communicate all together: as the maner was of the miniſters in the primatiue churche? Is it of neceſſitie or a purpoſed alterynge of Chriſtes inſtitution, when that ye turne it from a Communion and Supper, to a worke that one man may do to the benefite of many: and there by

haue made it a marchandiſe to bie and
ſell for your owne gaine? What colour
or ſhadowe haue you for this in the
Scripture? Surely, weare my mode-
ration muche more then yours is, I
coulde not chuſe but terme this, not an
itchinge foly, but an impudent wilful-
nes, ſo plainely to goe againſte the ex-
preſſe and apointed forme of the ſacra-
7. mente. Becauſe ye vrge ſo earneſtly
to haue dew profe againſte ſole recei-
uinge by the prieſte, if the people will
not communicate: I will ſhewe you
ſome reaſons. But before I enter into
that, I muſt warne you once agayne,
that, if our reaſons weare not ſo well
able to proue neceſſitée: yet coulde you
not conclude your purpoſe, for that
your priuate maſſe is nothinge leſſe
then neceſſitée. In neceſſitée many thin-
ges may be graunted, that otherwyſe
are not tollerable. The thiefe, that
Chriſte at his death witneſſed ſhould
be with him in Paradiſe, was neuer

baptiſed: beinge excluded by neceſſitie. The auncient hiſtories make mencion of diuers martirs, that died before they weare baptiſed, beinge excluded by neceſſitee. And yet is this ſentence neuer the leſſe true: Baptiſme is neceſſarie to a chriſtian man. Likewiſe if wee ſhould graunte your caſe of neceſſitee, yet is this ſentence alway true: The ſupper of the Lorde in the ordinary vſe of it ought of neceſſitie to haue communicants to be partakers of it. But ye ſhall heare the foundacion of our proffes againſte ſole receiuinge by the prieſt in place of miniſtery: and they ſhall not bee gaily garniſhed with colours and amplifications, to make theim appere more goodly then they be, but plainly and nakedly ſet forthe, that euen the meaneſt may ſee what force and ſtrength they haue. For I write not this ſo muche to you, whom I know not, as to an number partely of vnlearned perſons, partly yonge men learned, but not much conuerſant in the ſcriptures, to whoſe handes theſe your writinges beinge brought hathe borne a greater face of proffe, then any man meanly conuerſante in the controuerſies of this time: can acknowledge to be in them. Our proufe is this: In the celebration of this Sacramente of the Lordes Supper wee ought to do that only and nothing els, that Chriſt the aucthour of it did in his inſtitution. But in Chriſtes inſtitution appeareth neither ſole receiuinge, nor miniſtring vnder one kinde: Therfore in celebration of this Sacrament neither ſole receiuinge nor minyſtringe vnder one kinde ought to bee vſed. The maior is Sainte Cyprian proued at large and much ſtaied vpon in his Epiſtle, *ad Cecilium de ſacramento ſanguinis*, in the beginninge wherof he ſeemeth to ſignifie that by inſpiration hee was admonyſhed of God, to aduertiſe men only to do as Chriſte did in the inſtitution of

Prouffes againſte priuate maſſe, out of the ſcripture.

his Sacrament. I thought it (ſaith hee) both godly and neceſſary to write, if any man continew in this errour (he meaneth vſing water only in the Sacrament in ſtede of wine) that he, ſeing the lighte, doe returne to the roote and beginninge of the lordes ordinance and inſtitution. And thinke not that I doe this vpon my owne phantaſie or any humayne iudgement. &c. But when one is charged by the inſpiration and commaundmente of god, it is neceſſary for a faithful ſeruant to obey: beyng holden excuſed with all men, becauſe he taketh nothinge vpon hym arrogantly, that is compelled to feare the diſpleaſure of god, if he doe not as he is bidde. Doe you know therefore that we be admoniſhed, that in offeringe the ſacrament of the lordes bloud his owne inſtitution ſhould be kepte and no other thinge bee done, then that the lorde dyd firſt for vs him ſelfe. No man can make any exception to this propoſition, vnleſſe he wyll cleane weaken Cyprians reaſon againſte thoſe abuſers of the Sacrament. And then ſhal we haue no ground to ſtay vpon, but euery gloſe or interpretation vpon humayne pretenſes ſhalbe admitted. This aſſertion of

Cyprian is confirmed by Ambroſe vpon the firſt to the Corinthes. There hee ſaith, that they receiue the Sacrament vnworthely whiche celebrate otherwiſe then the Lorde deliuered it. For he (ſaith Ambroſe) cannot bee deuoute, which preſumeth to doe it otherwiſe then the aucthour hathe taughte. Yea and addeth that we ſhall make an accompte howe we haue vſed it. For the proofe of the Minor, let vs conſider the hiſtorie therof as it is ſet out in the Euangeliſtes. In the celebration of the Sacramente vſed by Chriſte there appereth two partes: the mattier and the forme: The mattier is bread & the body of Chriſte, wine and the bloud of Chriſt, of which, hee that altereth or taketh away any, doth alter and maime chriſtes inſtitution, as appereth by Ciprian. The forme of miniſtringe the Sacramente muſt be taken out of Chriſtes doinges. At that time it was taken, bleſſed with thankes geuinge, broken, diſtributed, eaten, dronken, charge geuen to remember Chriſte and his death. Therfore hee that altereth or taketh away any of theſe things maimeth the forme of chriſtes inſtitution, and breaketh Ciprians rule. Moreouer the force of theſe wordes, Gaue to them preſent, doth binde to a company: becauſe it ſignifieth a beſtowinge of the death of chriſte not to one but to many. Therefore in Luke he geueth an expreſſe commaundmente of diſtributinge, as hee doeth of eating, and drinking: ſaying, Take you this and deuide it amonge you. But howe can he deuyde it, if there bee not a company to receiue it: onleſſe we ſhould, to the deludinge of Chriſtes ordeinance, make ſuche a phantaſticall breakynge and deuiding, as you doo in your maſſe. For therin by Sergius decrée ye breake it into thrée partes: thone of which ye let fall into the wine: which there ſoked ſignifieth the body of Chriſt rayſed from death, and ſittinge in the glory:

The other drie parte, that the pryeſte eateth, ſignifieth the body of Chriſt beinge vpon the earth. The thirde parte, which is wonte to tary on the aulter to the ende of maſſe, ſignifieth the deade in the Sepulchers vntill the daye of iudgement. O great vanities wherewith God puniſheth the raſhnes of foliſhe men folowynge their owne phantaſies, and leauing his holy word. But to returne to the proofe of the matter. I wyll folow Cipryans example, and confirme the maner of Chriſtes inſtitution by the teſtimony of. S. Paul. In him I finde two argumentes. One is in theſe wordes, *Vnus panis vnum corpus multi ſumus. Nam omnes de eodem pane participamus.* Which wordes the holy fathers interpreting, cal the Lordes holy ſupper a Sacramente of vnitée. Becauſe that as the breade conſiſteth of many graines, and the wine made of many grapes, ſo wée, that bee partakers of that one loffe and one cuppe, ſhould be knit together in loue and charitée, as the members and partes of one miſtical body. Wherfore Chriſoſtome noteth that it is not ſayde, this eateth of one breade, and hee of another: but all be partakers of one breade: and addeth why we be one loffe and one body. Becauſe of the common participacion that we haue of the ſacrament. This ſignificacion is cleane taken away by priuate maſſe: the vſe wherof may ſéeme rather to be a Sacrament of ſeparation and diſpenſion, as after ſhall more appere. The ſeconde argumente out of Sainct Paul is, where to the Corinth. he reprehendeth the abuſe of the lords Supper brought in by diſſenſion and factions, that weare amonge them. Wherby it came to paſſe, that one company would not tary for another to communicate, but one ſort would receiue with out another. Againſt this abuſe hee allegeth the inſtitution of Chriſt ſignifienge the ſame to be againſt ſuch receiuinge uſinge in partes, and therfore exhorteth them to tary vntill the congregation came together, that they might receiue according to Chriſtꝭ inſtitution. That this was .S. Paules minde, it appeareth by his firſt propoſition and reaſon, and by the concluſion that he addeth in the ende. When ye come together (ſaith he) ye can not eate the Lordes ſupper, wher firſte it is to be noted that to the celebracion of the ſacrament they reſorted together, and were not priuately in ſundry corners. He addeth the reaſon why they coulde not at their méetinges celebrate the Lordes ſupper. Becauſe euery man is occupied in eatynge his owne ſupper. Herein Paule blameth them, not onely for immoderate féedynge of their owne meate, but alſo for the diſordered vſing of the Lordes ſupper in partes: where as they ſhould be together, as Chriſt and his Apoſtles were. This he declareth more plainly in that concluſion, that he inferreth vpon the reherſall of chriſtes wordes in ordering the ſacrament. For he ſaieth. Therfore my brethern, when ye come together to eate the Lordes ſupper, do you tarie one for an other. What can more plainely declare that S. Paule toke the right vſe of the ſacrament to be a common receiuynge together, and not a ſeuerall vſe by one man alone. As if he had ſaid: In christes ſupper ye ſe the maiſter together with the diſciples, the table and the meate common to all, not ſo muche as Judas the traitour excluded, one lofe and one cuppe diſtributed amonge the whole companie. Therfore when yee come together ye muſt imitate the concorde and equalitie, that he then vſed. If he thought it an abuſe in the Corinthes to receiue in partes, he woulde counte it a farre greater abuſe for .x. or xii. to receiue eache of them ſeuerally in one church, at one time, as though they were of diuers religions, or membres of diuers miſticall bodies. If the Corinthes in receiuyng by partes were blamed of Paule, for that they ſeemed one to contemne an other: may not priſtes be as iuſtly blamed, becauſe they ſeeme in their priuate Maſſe to diſdeine and contempne the people? I wil now therfore conclude with Cyprians wordes.

Yf ſo be both it be ordeined by chriſte, and the ſame confirmed by the Apoſtle, that wee ſhould do in this ſacrament as our Lord did: wee finde that wee keepe not that is commaunded, if we do otherwiſe then Chriſt did.

Seeyng then Chriſte vſed company in ordeinyng the ſacramente of that holy feaſt and ſupper: Prieſtes alſo ought to haue company in miniſtring the ſame.

Proufes againſte priuate maſſe, out of the fathers.

For the authoritee of the primatiue churche to confirme that this is ẏ right vſe of the ſacramente, I will in this place bringe in onely two witneſſes: which ſhall not ſpeake of this matter lightly or by the way: but of very purpoſe declare the maner that then was vſed amonge the people of God, alowed and confirmed by godly and holy fathers. In ſo much that if any other maner had ben then vſed, they coulde not haue omitted the ſame: eſpecially ſeyng they profeſſed to declare ẏ maner of chriſtians therin. Iuſtine the martir in his Apologie deſcriueth it thus. After prayer wee ſalute eache other with a kiſſe: then breade and the cuppe mixed with water is brought to the chief brother, which after he hath taken geuing praiſe and thankes vnto the father of all in the name of the ſunne and holy ghoſt, for a ſpace he continueth in thankes geuynge. After praiers and thankes geuyng, the whole company ſaieth Amen. When the miniſters geuynge of thankes, and the peoples well wiſſhynge is finiſſhed: thoſe whiche wee call deacons geue parte of the breade and cuppe, ouer whiche thankes is geuen, vnto euery one that is preſent, yea and ſuffer the ſame to be caried to them that be abſent. This nouriſſhment we call Euchariſtiam, the ſacrament of thankes geuing. A litle after he declareth the ſame thyng agayne. On ſunday (ſaith he) companies of the towne and countrey come together. Where leſſons of the prophetes and Apoſtles be redde. When the clarke ceaſeth, the miniſter exhorteth and allureth them to the imitation of ſo holy thinges. After, we all ariſe and pray. Then (as I ſaid) bread and wyne mixed with water is brought foorth, and the chiefe miniſter ſo muche as he can praieth, and geueth thankes, the people ſyngyng Amen. Then the thynges conſecrated are diſtributed to al preſent, and be ſent by the Deacons to thoſe that be abſent. The ſame forme and maner of celebracion of the ſacrament with very little difference is witneſſed by *Dioniſius*: who in *Eccleſiaſtica Hierarchia* after he hath deſcriued a few other circumſtances, and noted that only they taried in the churche whiche weare meete for the ſighte and communion of the deuine and holy ſacrament addeth this. After hee hathe ſhewen the gifts of thoſe diuine workes he both commeth to the communion of the ſame hymſelfe, and alſo allureth other. When the dyuine communion is bothe taken and geuen, it endeth in holy thankes geuinge. Woulde a man deſire any plainer teſtimony of the vſe of the Lordes ſupper in the primatiue Churche? Doth not all thynges agre with the inſtitution of Chriſte and example of the Apoſtle? Is here any coniecture either of the laitie receiuing vnder one kinde? or of ſole receiuynge by the prieſt? or of ſacrifienge the body and bloud of Chriſte for quicke & dead? Is here any worde or ceremony that ſignifieth ſuche vſe to haue bene at that time? Yet (as I ſayd) theſe men write not of this mattier by the way, but of purpoſe vndertoke to ſhew the maner of the churche in their daies. And wyll you yet continew to affirme that wee haue no colour or title in the ſcripture and fathers for the reproffe of your priuate maſſe. But ye wil vrge, after your maner, to haue an expreſſe ſentence, that forbiddeth the prieſt to receiue without company. I anſwere Chriſtes inſtitucion, the example of the apoſtels, the common vſe of the fathers was otherwayes: therfore the prieſte ſhould not communicate without other. Ye haue no expreſſe commaundemente that forbiddeth you to baptiſme in the name of the father only, but that chriſtes inſtitution was otherwiſe. Wyl ye therfore ſay that ye may withoute offence baptiſe in the name of the father only? If chriſtes inſtitution in baptiſme be a ſufficient forbidding of the contrary to be vſed: why ſhould not his wordes and maner vſed in the ſupper forbidde you to doe the contrary? Ciprian (as I haue ſayde) taketh it for a full prohibition of the contrary: and if you wil not, ye muſt of neceſſitie weaken his reaſoninge againſt thoſe that he writeth: which dyd bringe euen as good reaſons and as holy conſiderations for their parte, as ye be able to deuiſe any for yours. Now that I haue in this manner layed the foundacion of our prowfes, I wil procede to examine the reſidew of your argumentes againſte vs.

4. Cap. In recityng the aucthoritie of Chriſoſtome you bryngе in a ſimilitude or compariſon, which of how ſmall force they be in prouyng, your learnyng can

not be ſo little, but that ye muſt nédes knowe. Euen as (ſay you) it is to be wiſſhed that al contencion and ſtrife were cleane baniſſhed, and yet men are not to be forbidden to ſue for their rightes when they be iniured: ſo is it to be wiſſhed that people were ſo deuoute, as they woulde dayly receiue their howſill (for ſo ye terme it.) And yet is not the prieſt to be letted to receiue, when the people wil not diſpoſe them ſelues vnto it. Beſide that ye conclude here only the caſe of neceſſitie (whiche healpeth the common vſe of your priuate Maſſe very little.) Ye make your compariſon betweene thynges very vnlike and of nature diuers: that is, betweene poſſible and vnpoſſible, and lawful & vnlawful. That all cotencion ſhould be baniſſhed from amonge men in this worlde is a thing vnpoſſible, & a perfection not to be looked for in this fraile life. But in a chriſtian congregacion to haue ſome of the people or miniſters to cõmunicate orderly with the chiefe miniſter celebratynge is a thynge ſo poſſible, as bothe the ſpace of many hundred yeres it was continually vſed in the churche, and may at this day with good example and inſtruction of the miniſters be brought to paſſe, although not every day, yet very often times. Moreouer to ſue for ones right is not only a thing ſuffered, but of it ſelfe lawful and good: and wée haue therof example and authoritée in gods worde. But for the prieſt to miniſter the lordes ſupper alone, is a thyng neither tollerable nor lawfull, but contrarie to the forme that Chriſt him ſelf vſed, neither haue wée either authoritée or example in the ſcripture as a ſufficient warrant to alter that forme that he vſed and apointed. Therfore your compariſon is fautie on bothe partes: and eſpecially for that ye ſéeme to gather therby, that it is no more neceſſarie for company to receiue with the prieſt, then it is to haue all contencion baniſſhed from chriſtian men: whiche, as I haue ſayd, in the frailtée of this worlde is vnpoſſible. If ſuche ſimilitudes ſhould be alowed, a man might breake all gods commaundementes, and yet proue him ſelf not to do amiſſe. Is not this a ioyly reaſon thinke you? As it is to be wiſſhed that all variance and ſtrife were cleane abandoned from amonge chriſtian men, and yet are not they to be forbidden to ſue for their right, which be iniured of other: ſo it is to be wiſſhed that all vnmaried prieſtes did liue chaſte: but if they can not, the biſſhop muſt not forbid them to haue a coſen of theirs to kéepe their houſe, with whom, *Si non caſte, tamen caute*. This compariſon is as rightly applied as yours is, and yet, how well it proueth, I will make your ſelfe iudge. All your drifte in this parte is, by alledgyng the corruption of the worlde and ſlackneſſe of deuocion, to ſignifie, that the people can not bee brought to communicate with the prieſt: and therfore of neceſſitie that he may receiue alone. But, be the world neuer ſo corrupte, I thinke it as vnpoſſible, to haue a prieſt to celebrate deuoutly euery day: as it is to haue ſome of the people often times to communicate with the prieſt. Wherfore I may as effectually conclude, vpō the corruption of this time, that prieſtes can not bee brought deuoutly to Maſſe euery day: as ye do, that the people can not diſpoſe them ſelfe, in this colde charitie, godly to frequent the ſacrament. And then were ye beſt to reſtraine your dayly maſſynge prieſtes, and apoincte them, either to once, or at leaſt to fewer times in the yere: as ye haue taken order for the people generally to receiue only at Eaſter. But the B prieſte (ſay you) is bounde to offer vp the dayly ſacrifice for himſelfe and for the people. This is the roote of all the abuſes of the Lordes ſupper, that ye haue brought into the churche of chriſt. This is it, wherwith ye do pitifully deface the death and paſſion of Chriſt, makinge your ſelues, for your glories ſake, as it were means of reconciliacion betwene god and his people. This is it, that hathe diſcouraged chriſtian people from the often vſe and frequentacion of the Sacramente. For hereby ye ſignifie, that, of neceſſitie, it apperteineth only to the prieſt, and (as you wrote before) the people to be lefte free to come as ſeldome as they wyl. This ye take for the grounde of your reaſon in this place: and yet within few lines haue twiſe reherſed it withoute any proofe at all. But in déede ye muſte of neceſſitée leaue ẏ vnproued: that ye be not in any wiſe able to proue. For, ſure I am, that neither the inſtitucion of Chriſt maketh mencion of any oblation or ſacrifice to be done by the miniſter, ſauinge only the ſacrifice of thankes geuing: nor yet the ſcripture appointeth any bounden duty for the prieſt more to vſe the ſacrament then other godly and wel diſpoſed chriſtian men. What ſignificacion haue you in the wordes that chriſt vſed in ordeining the ſacrament, or in the maner of his doynge, that hee then offered him ſelfe to his father? He did that the next day after him ſelf vpon the croſſe, as S. Paule ſaieth, perfectly once for euer: neither doeth he graunt his priuilege of the euerlaſting prieſthodde to any, but to him ſelfe. Therfore when your prieſtes take vppon them his office to offer ſacrifice propitiatorie: they goe beyonde theyr commiſſion, and take more vpon them then their dutie, not without iuſte reprehenſion of arrogancie and preſumption. Chriſtes inſtitution (as the euangeliſtes & S. Paule ſetteth it foorth) is a teaching that hee gaue to vs his bleſſed body and bloud: and not that wee ſhould offer it vp to god the father. He ſayde, Take, eate, doo this in remembrance of mee, he ſaid not, geue, offer, and ſacrifice for your ſinnes. A ſacrifice is a thinge geuen to God: the ſacramente was a thinge geuen to vs. Nothinge therfore can be of nature more contrary then your ſacrifice, and chriſtes ſacramente. Wherfore it muſt néedes bee that ye ſucked this erroure oute of the phraſes and faſhions of ſpeakynge, that the olde fathers vſed, peruertinge the ſame to a farre worſe ſence, then euer they ment it. This thinge more euidently to declare, it behoueth to conſider, that the fathers vpon dyuers occaſions vſed to call the Sacrament, by the name of an oblation or ſacrifice.

For what cauſes the Lordes ſupper is called of the Doctours a ſacrifice.

1. Firſt, *Clemens*, *Alexander*, *Tertullian*, *Iræneus* and other make mencion of a certaine oblation or offering that Chriſten people commonly vſed, when they came together to celebrate the Lordes Supper. In this they offered vp bread, wyne, and vituals abundantly, not only to ſerue the communion (as wee

had a ſhadow of late yeres in the holy loſe): but alſo that of the ouerplus therof aſwell the miniſters might haue their findinge, as poore people alſo be refreſhed. Hereof partely it came to paſſe, (the example beinge taken firſte of the common people) that the admyniſtracion of the Sacramente, of this offeringe, was called an oblation. As in Iræneus lib. 4 cap. 32. *He taught vs a new oblacion of the new teſtamente: whiche, the church takinge of the apoſtels, offereth vp to god in all the worlde.* But in other places after, as in ẏ. 34. cap. he expoundeth him ſelfe and ſignifieth that he ſpeaketh not of the offeringe of the Sacrament conſecrated, but of the breade and wine offered: partely, to the vſe of the ſupper: partely, to the findinge of the poore. *It behoueth vs* (ſaith hee) *to offer to god the firſt fruites of his creatures.* And againe a lyttle after. *We muſt make offeringe vp to god and in all thinges be found thankfull to god our maker, offeringe vp to him the firſte fruites of his creatures, in pure mynde, in* faith without hipocriſie, in firme hope, in feruent loue. And this pure offeringe the church only offereth to our maker, geuinge to hym parte of his creatures with thankes geuyng. Juſtine alſo, in his Apology, affirmeth: that, after the communion, all that would offered to the behalfe of poore people, fatherleſſe children, and ſicke perſons. 2. An other occaſion that the doctours vſed thoſe termes of ſacrifienge and offeringe was, that in celebration of the Sacramente, they had prayer for all ſtates, and thankes geuing to god for all his benefites: which the doctours in infinite places affirme to be the true and only ſacrifice of the new teſtament. Clemens Alexan. Strom. 7. lib. If god reioiſeth to be honoured, wher as by nature he nedeth nothing: not withoute good cauſe we honour him with prayers, and ſend vp to him that moſt excellent and holy ſacrifice. And after in proceſſe of writing he geueth the ſame name to the reading and ſtudy of a godly man. Wherby it may appeare (as Sainct Auguſtine alſo ſignifieth) that the fathers called euery good and godly action a ſacrifice, weare it priuate or common. And therefore their ſucceſſours, by lyttle and little bente the ſame name vnto the action and celebration of the Sacramente: wherin moſt ſolemly prayer and thankes geuinge were offered. So wryteth Iræneus lib. 4. cap. 34. We offer to him not as one that nedeth, but geuing thankes for his benefites to vs. And againe. He wyll haue vs to offer our gift to the aulter often times: our aulter is in heauen. For thether our praiers and offeringes be directed. To this agreeth Euſebius de demonſtr. Euang. lib. 1. We offer (ſaith he) to the moſt high god a ſacrifice of praiſe: we offer a ful, ſwete, and holy ſacrifice, after a new ſort, according to the new teſtament. And that ye may not obiecte, that in this place he ſpeaketh not of the ſacrament: It foloweth in this wiſe. Let my prayer be made as incenſe in thy ſight. Therfore we do ſacrifice and burne incenſe to him: ſometime, celebrating the remembrance of that great ſacrifice, accordinge to the miſteries inſtituted by him ſelfe, bothe geuing thankes to god for our ſaluation, and offering holy hymnes and prayers vnto him: ſome time, conſecrating and bequethinge our ſelues holly to him both in body and mynde. Here he ſpeaketh of the ſacrament and maketh no mencion of any ſacrifice propitiatory, but only of the ſacrifice of remembrance by prayer and thankes geuinge, and of the offeringe vp of our ſelues to god: which is the offerynge of Chriſtes miſtical body, that, ſaint Auguſtine ſpeaketh of in dyuers places. Of whoſe teſtimonies ye are wonte to bringe ſome for the confirmation of your ſacrifice. As that hee hath, De ciuitate dei. The ſacrifice (ſaith he) that we offer is Chriſtes body. But immediatly he declareth, that hee ment his miſticall body, that is, the vnitie of the faithfull congregation. For he addeth. which wee offer not to martirs, becauſe they be the ſame body them ſelfe. Now the biſhop or chiefe miniſter offereth vp the people in the communion, hee ſheweth in his. 59. Epiſtle ad Paulinū. Another cauſe, that the 3.

holy fathers call yͤ ſacrament an oblacion or ſacrifice is, becauſe, according to chriſtes ordinance, we celebrate the remembraunce of his death and paſſion: which was the onely, true, and perfit ſacrifice. And ſo may ye perceiue, that Euſebius did take it in the place before recited. For he ſaieth, we ſacrifice, celebratinge the remembrance of that greate ſacrifice. &c. Chriſoſtome likewiſe Hom. 17 ad Ebreos. After he hath in many wordes declared, that there is no more but one ſacrifice once offered by Chriſte for euer, he addeth this. Doe not we then offer euery day? yes verely we offer. But doing it in remembrance of his death. And againe, That we doe, is done to the remembrance of that was done before. Sainct Auguſtine alſo de fide ad petrum, declareth the ſame very plainly. Beleue ſtedfaſtly (ſaieth he) and in no wayes doubte, that the only begotten of God, beyng made fleſh for vs, did offer him ſelfe a ſacrifice to God as a ſweete ſauour. To whom with the father and holy ghoſt in the olde teſtament beaſtes were offered: and to whom now, together with the father and holy ghoſt, with whom he hath one diuinitie, the churche ceaſeth not to offer the ſacrifice of breade and wine. (He ſaieth not of the body and bloud of Chriſt.) For in thoſe carnall ſacrifices there was the figure of the fleſhe of Chriſt: which.&c. but in this our ſacrifice, there is a thankes geuinge and remembrance of the body and bloud of Chriſt, that hee gaue and ſhed for vs. Here he ſaith not, there is an offering of the body & bloud for our ſinnes, whiche he would not haue omitted, if the churche had taught ſo in his time. For ſome of theſe cauſes before reherſed, the fathers vſed to cal the Lords ſupper a ſacrifice: not meanyng, as you do, ẏ it was a ſacrifice propitiatorie to be offered of ẏ prieſtes for them ſelfe & for the people. This your facion of ſpeakyng ye ſéeme to take of the maner of ẏ Iewiſſe prieſtes: which had an offeryng for them & the people. As though Chriſt had left to vs a like ſacrifice, as they had, dayly to be repeted: where as S. Paule in his whole Epiſtle to the Ebrues reaſoneth againſt it: and proueth the contrarie, that Chriſte did it perfitly once for euer, in ſuche ſorte, that it needeth not to be reiterated. But perhappes ye will obiecte S. Cyprian, where he speakynge of the dead ſaieth: We offer ſacrifice for them. But it is euident he offered there for Martiers: whiche, he was throughly perſwaded, were in heauen, and needed no offerynge for their ſinnes. Likewiſe Ambroſe mencioneth, that he offered for Ualentinia the good Emperour: of whom (in the oracion made at his buriall) he witneſſeth that he doubted not of his ſaluacion, but beleeued, by the witneſſe of Angels, that he was caried to heauen. Therfore their offeryng for the deade was no more, but, as I mencioned before, the ſacrifice of prayſe and thankes geuynge to God for them. This thyng the Greeke Cannon declareth more plainely: where it is mencioned, that they offered for the Patriarkes, Prophetes,

phetes, Apoſtles, ye and for the bleſſed virgin Mary the mother of God. For whoſe ſinnes, it can not be, that they offered: whiche, by the teſtimony and faith of the whole church, be with God in heauen. This thynge is well deſcriued by Chriſoſtom vpon the. 8. *cap.* of Math. Therfore (ſaith he) the prieſt ſtanding at the aulter, when the ſacrifice is propoſed, commaundeth vs to offer thankes to God for the whole world, for them that be abſēt, for thoſe that were before vs, and for thoſe that ſhall come after vs. The ſame Chriſoſtome alſo calleth this their offerynge, Rationalem cultum, whiche wee can not interprete a propitiatorie ſacrifice, but a reaſonable worſhippyng of God by praier and thankes geuyng for his holy ſainctes: by the whiche he hath builded his churche, and whiche nowe remaine as membres and partes of his miſticall body: wherunto we alſo, by the celebration of the ſacrament, be ioygned, and ſo, as it were, knitte in vnitie with them. This was their offeryng for the dead, and not a practiſe to pull ſoules out of Purgatorie for marchandiſe and money, as ye haue vſed in your priuate Maſſes a great numbre of yeres, to the great defaſing of the death and paſſion of Chriſte. Wherfore your Maſſe can not iuſtly be called the Lords ſupper, but a peruertyng of the inſtitution and ordinãce, cleane to an other purpoſe and ende, then he willed to be kepte amonge his people. For the Lordes ſupper (as I ſayde before) is a gifte of God to vs: whiche wée muſte receiue with thankes geuyng. Your ſacrifice is a price to be paied to God, and of him to be taken as a ſatiſfactiõ. The Lordes ſupper is a remembrance of one perfit ſacrifice: wherby we were once ſufficiently purged from ſinne, and continually are reuiued by ỹ ſame. Your ſacrifice is a dayly offeryng vp of Chriſte for our ſinnes: as thoughe it had not ben perfitely done at the firſt. The Lordes ſupper is to be diſtributed in the common aſſembly of his people, to teache vs the communion whereby wee all be knitte together in Chriſte Ieſu. The vſe of your ſacrifice in priuate Maſſe ſéemeth, by the prieſtes ſole receiuyng, to be a teſtimony of ſeperacion, and a meane to bryng the communitée out of chriſtian mens mindes. For, after they once beléeued, that prieſtes muſt ſacrifice for them: they began to leaue the communion, and frequentation of the ſacramẽt, as a thing either not apperteinyng, or very little apperteining to them, but eſpecially to prieſtes. And, by that meanes, the way was made to your common vſe of priuate Maſſe. So muche difference therefore as is betwéene to géeue, and to receiue: to remember one perfẽt ſacrifice, and dayly to reiterate a ſacrifice: to celebrate in common as a teſtimony of vnitie, to créepe in corners or by chappels as a ſigne of ſeperation: ſo muche difference is there betwéene the ſacrament by Chriſte apoincted, and the ſacrifice of the Maſſe by you deuiſed. This haue I ſpoken more largely of this mattier, then either I purpoſed, or you gaue me occaſion by any proofe brought for the confirmation of your ſacrifice. Firſt, becauſe this is an other great abuſe in your priuate Maſſe, that yee take vpon you to defende. Secondly, that I might declare the grounde of your reaſon to be very weake, where ye affirme the prieſt to bee bounde of duitie to ſacrifice for him ſelfe and for the people. Thirdly, that I might anſwere more aptly to Chriſoſtomes aucthoritie, which nexte is to be examined.

5. Cap.

A. The place of Chriſoſtome, that you alledge, is otherwiſe in him, then you recite it. For he ſaieth: *Fruſtra habetur quotidiana oblatio, Fruſtra ſtamus ad altare: nemo eſt, qui ſimul participet.* In vayne we haue our dayly offeryng: in vayne we ſtande at thaulter: there is no man to communicate with vs. As touching thoſe wordes that

In anſwere to Chriſoſto.

ye moſte beate vpon, There is no man to communicate, by them to proue, that they receiued only at Eaſter, and, at other times, there were none at all to communicate with the miniſters: I wyll ſhew you out of Chriſoſtome him ſelfe, that they muſt of neceſſitie haue an other ſence: and that in thoſe wordes he vſeth that figure of aggrauatinge, that he commonly vſeth in all places. For

D.

euen in the ſame place, not many lines before the wordes that ye recite, he declareth that a number vſed to receiue at certaine other times.

C.

I ſe many (ſaith hee) raſhly, not paſſyng how, and more of a cuſtome then lawfully and of good conſideration, to be partakers of chriſtes body. Yf the holy time of Lent were at hand (ſay they) if the day of Epiphanie were come: hauinge no regarde what he is, that is partaker of the miſteries. But the time of cumming to it, the Epiphanie, the holy ſeaſon of Lente doth not make them worthy that come: but the ſinceritie and puritie of minde. Do ye not here perceiue, that many vſed ordinarely to come to the Communion at the Epiphanie, and in lent, as well as he mencioned before at Eaſter? howe can ye then gather by Chriſoſtome that there was no company to receiue but only at Eaſter? but what if I declare oute of Chriſoſtome, that ſome vſed to receiue oftener times? wyll not your collection vppon this place, that ye ſeeme to triumphe vpon, appere to be of very ſmal force. Hom. 17. ad Hebreos. Many (ſaieth he) take of this ſacrifice once in the whole yere, ſome twiſe, ſome oftener times. Hereby it is moſte euident, that Chriſoſtom had other to communicate with him at diuers other times beſide Eaſter. The maner was (I graunte) that ſome of cuſtome addicted theim ſelues to certayne dayes. And in ſome places the biſhops or ſinodes apointed men to receiue, once, twiſe, thriſe or fower times in the yere (as Auguſtine witneſſeth). Concilium Eliberinum apoynteth to communicate thriſe in the yere. But theſe preſcripte times were ordeined onely for them, that vſed ſeldome to come to the ſacrament, that at the leaſte, they ſhould receiue at thoſe times, if they would knowlage them ſelues to bée of the church. Notwithſtandinge they did not only leaue frée to other to frequent the ſacrament, but earneſtly calleth them to it at euery aſſembly of the people. As Ambroſe greuouſly blameth the cuſtome of many in the Eaſte partes, that vſed to come but once in the yere: and ſaith, that hée, whiche is not méete to receiue euery day, wyll not be méete to receiue once a yeare. Therfore as in the primatiue church very many in dyuers places vſed to be partakers of the ſacrament, but ones, twiſe, or thriſe, in the yere: ſo it is euident, that dyuers other better diſpoſed dyd receiue with the byſhop and miniſters at ſundry other times. That forto, becauſe they were not ſo many as they ſhould haue bene, and as Chriſoſtome wiſhed for to haue in his church, to exaggerate their ſlacknes, hee ſaieth, There is none ſo bee partaker with vs. Meaninge that they were very fewe and ſeldome in comparison of that their duitie was. But if ye wyll ſtand vppon theſe few ſillables, *Nemo eſt*, to proue that ſomtime the miniſter receiued alone: I anſwer, all be it this place did proue, that none of the common people would communicate, whoſe ſlacknes, he there reproueth: yet ye cannot by this teſtimony declare, that none of the miniſters or the clergie receiued with hym beynge byſhop there. For the maner was not then, as you do vſe it now, that euery prieſte receiued particularly at an aulter by him ſelfe: but all the myniſters and clergy did communicate together with the byſhop or chiefe miniſter that celebrated. This to proue true, although I coulde bringe in many examples and teſtimonies, yet I will content my ſelfe with one, that your ſelfe putteth me in minde of, in recitinge afterwarde the.14.cannon of Nicene counſell: for therein order is taken by that holy counſell, that the deacons ſhould not miniſter to the byſhop and prieſts, nor receiue before them, but after in order as it ſeemed more conuenient. Loke for further declaration of this, in examininge the cannon that ye afterwarde alledge. Wherefore this your place of Chriſoſtome doth not ſufficiently iuſtifie ſole receiuinge by one miniſter, as ye would haue it ſeeme to do, for proufe of your priuate maſſe. But if I ſhould flatly deny, that the myniſter receiued, when none of the people were partakers, how coulde you proue it by this place? Ye wyl ſay, becauſe he calleth it, *Quotidianam oblationem*, and the people, as appeareth, did not euery day communicate. I anſwere, hee named it *Oblationem*, either for that it was done in the remembraunce of Chriſtes ſacrifice, or for the offeringe vp of the breade and wine to the celebration of

the Lordes ſupper: he called it *Quotidianam*, to the inmitacion of the ſacrifice of the olde lawe: not becauſe it was euery day done withoute intermiſſion, but for that it was oftentimes celebrated: that is, ſo often as the people aſſembled together to the church or common place of prayer: as hee him ſelfe witneſſeth vpon the. 8. chapiter of Mathew. At which times he alwaies had, either ſome of the people, or the reſidew of the myniſters and clergie to communicate with him: as the maner of that time was. But ye wil here dal-
B ly vpon the proper ſignification of this worde, *Quotidianum*, euery day without intermiſſion, euery day daily ſacrifice, euery day maſſe, euery day at the aulter. Then muſt you geue mee leaue as extremely to vrge theſe two ſillables *Fruſtra*, in vaine is oure oblation, in vaine is our ſacrificing, to no profite or commoditie is our maſſe, in vayne we ſtande at the aulter, becauſe it is done without

without company to receiue with vs. And ſurely, if a man rightly conſider this place, he may iuſtly meruaile, why ye would alledge it for priuate maſſe. For in déede there is no thinge, that hathe any colour for it, but only the wreaſted argument, that you wrynge out of the ſound of theſe wordes, *Quotidiana oblatio*, and *Nemo eſt qui participet*: by the tone parte gatheringe, that the people then vſed to receiue only at Eaſter, as they doo now: by the tother, that the prieſt receiued euery day, and there vpon conclude your ſole receiuinge. Which your collection of how ſmall effecte it is, any man may perceiue, if hee conſider theſe twoo thinges before declared. Firſt, that at that time all the miniſters receiued together, as it ſhall be afterward more plainly proued by your owne teſtimonies. Secondly, ỷ I haue euidently ſhewed oute of Chriſoſtome him ſelfe, that many vſed to receiue at diuers other times of the yeare beſide

Eaſter. For in déede hee doth not there blame the generall maner of all without exception, but of a number, that addicted theim ſelfe either to Eaſter, or ſome other times, whether they were méete, or vnméete: And at other common ſeaſons would not frequent the ſacramente, though they were more mete to receiue. But theſe were not al (as I ſayd) but a number of the common people: and yͤ reſidew of the better diſpoſed were ſo few, as oftentimes when the leſſons of ſcripture weare redde, when prayers and thankes geuing were made, when bread and wine were (as the maner was) offered vp for the communion: (whiche were the firſt partes of celebration as appereth in Juſtine) then he was compelled either to ſuffer the miniſters and clergie to receiue alone: or els for lacke of communicantꝭ to leaue of the reſidew of the miniſtration. And that is it, that he complaineth of, and ſaith is done in vaine:becauſe it was vnperfitly done. For the preparinge to communion, the prayers and thankes geuinge for that purpoſe, the offeringe vp of breade and wine, the callinge of the people to it, may ſeeme to be in vayne, when none dyd come to participate with the myniſters. Wherfore Chriſoſtome in this place doth not only nothinge confirme priuate maſſe, but alſo maketh very muche againſte it: and declareth, that hee toke the righte and trew vſe of the Lordes ſupper to bee, when the people were together partakers of the ſame. For if he had taken it, as you do, for an offeringe vp of the body of Chriſte for him ſelfe and the people, Or if hee had at ſuche tymes receiued alone, and thought it wel done, hee neither coulde nor would haue ſayd: *Fruſtra habetur quotidiana oblatio*, in vaine we haue our dayly offering, geuing no other reaſon why it was vain, but becauſe the people at ſuche tymes dyd not receiue. Therfore it appeareth by thoſe wordes, both how neceſſary hee eſtemed the peoples communion, and alſo that hee toke not *Oblationē* for a propitiatorie ſacrifice, as you do. For then he could not haue ſayde *fruſtra habetur*. To this purpoſe it maketh, that the ſame Chriſoſtome in the ſame place ſo earneſtly calleth the people to it: as he ſaith to them: Whoſoeuer is not partaker of the miſteries, doth impudently and wickedly to ſtande there. And in the. 17. Hom. Vpon the epiſtle to the Hebrewes, he ſignifieth, that the maner then was, that a deacon ſtode in a place higher then other, and with a ſigne of his handes and a lowde voice called the people to the communion. This was not only at Eaſter, but at other times alſo. By this earneſt maner of calling, therfore it may appere how muche this doctour toke it to be of the ſubſtance of the Sacrament, that a number ſhould be partakers of it: and how farre diuers hys maner was from the faſſhion of your

priuate

pꝛiuate maſſe. Now then your amplyfied cõcluſion, wherin ye clayme Chꝛiſoſtome to be wholy with you, ſheweth it ſelfe to be very vaine. And wée may now, as iuſtly ſay as wée did befoꝛe, that ye haue no pꝛœfe out of the aunciẽt fathers, foꝛ that ye dœ herein ſo earneſtly defende: And that wée haue right good teſtimonies both out of the ſcripture and out of the Doctours againſt it. Foꝛ ye muſte not vſe to grounde doctrines vpon the coniecture of a few ſillables in one ſentence: but compare the ſame with diuers other places, as well of the ſame doctour, as of other, and al together with the common vſe and maner of that time: and therby gather a perfit concluſion. If you will ſkanne and ſtay vpon euery woꝛde oꝛ clauſe in the Doctours, as you dœ of the holy ſcriptures, and not conſider them by conference with them ſelfe and other: you may eaſely erecte infinite new doctrines, that hitherto were neuer hearde of in the churche.

5. Cap. The reaſon, that you bring in, groũded (as you ſay) vpon our principall, is euen of as muche force, as the other before mencioned. A. That is not euidently determined in ſcripture (ſay you) ought to ſtande as indifferente: but the neceſſitie of cõpanie to receiue with the prieſt is no where determined: ergo it ought to remaine indifferent. Your ſeconde propoſition is not true. For I ſay, and partly before haue proued, that it is determined in Chriſtes inſtitucion. In Luke he ſaith, *Accipite hoc & diuidite inter vos.* But how can it be taken at the miniſters handes and deuided or diſtributed amonge thẽ, vnleſſe there be a companie. I ſe no ſufficient warrant, that ye can brynge vs for the diſcharge of this commaũdemente. If ye wyll ſay *Diuidite* is no commaundement, but a counſell, that may be vndone, and yet the ſubſtance of the ſacrament remains: then bylike

ye will ſay, Eate, drinke, is no commaundement: nor yet, do this in remembrance of me. But all be indifferent counſels that may bee altered (as you after ſay) by ſpirituall gouernours. So that your ſpiritual gouernours may by this meanes cleane alter Chriſtes inſtitution: and leauinge out eatinge, drinking, diſtributinge, doinge in remembrance of Chriſtes death, (as they haue done) deuiſe a a new faſhion of their owne braynes more fitte for the churche to vſe, then that order which Chriſt hath lefte. But as he taketh away the right vſe of the ſacramente, that taketh away from it, eatynge, drinkynge, and doynge in remembrance. &c. So I ſay that hee taketh away the ſame, that leaueth out diſtributynge. Whiche becauſe it can not be without companie, I conclude the Sacramente can not bee vſed in the celebration without companie. Cyprian teacheth you, that Chriſtes inſtitution ſhould be of more authoritie with you, than, ſo lightly, to change it at your owne pleaſure. Only Chriſt (ſaieth he) is to be hearde in the order of this ſacrament. And we muſt not in any wiſe departe from the preceptes of the Goſpell. The Apoſtle alſo more conſtantly and ſtoutly declareth in an other place, that the diſciples ought to obſerue and doo the ſame thynges, that their maiſter taught and dyd before them: ſaying in this wiſe. If either I or an angell from heauen teach you otherwiſe then I haue taught you before, accurſed be he. Seyng therfore, neither the apoſtle him ſelfe, nor an Angell from heauen can tell vs or teache vs otherwiſe, then that Chriſte hath once taught vs already, and the Apoſtle declared to vs: I meruayle how this came in vſe to doo contrary to that whiche Chriſte dyd. And what I pray you can be more contrarie, then, when Chriſte bad them drinke, to take away the cup: and, whan Chriſte bad them diſtribute amonge them, and S. Paule willed one to tarrie for an other, vntill they came together: yet contrarie to this (as you do) to miniſter and receiue alone.

lone. Therfore I ſay with Cyprian, that in alteryng the ſacrament, either by ſole receiuyng or géeuing vnder one kinde, ye worſhip God in vayne with mens tradicions. The mattier that Cyprian wrote againſt (that is) vſinge of water alone in the Sacramente in ſtéede of wyne, might perhappes, in caſe of neceſſitie, be graunted to ſome, that of nature coulde not abide wyne. Neuertheleſſe the neceſſitie of a few is not to be drawen to a general example in the common vſe of the Lordes ſupper. Euen ſo it may be graunted that in caſes of neceſſitie one may receiue alone: and yet that is not to be taken for a common maner and faſhion in the churche, when the ſacrament is celebrated, as you vſed in the priuate Maſſe. That many circumſtancies of B, place, perſon, and time, may be altered or taken away for good conſiderations, without impeachement to the right vſe of the ſacramentes, wée graunte you:

but that company in receiuyng is one of thoſe circūſtances, that wée can not graunte: as well for the reaſons before declared, as alſo that wée haue no authoritée or example of the Apoſtles or primatiue churche, that wée may ſo do, as wée haue in all other thynges that you recite with moe wordes then néedeth. Wée dare miniſter in other places then Iurie, becauſe wée ſe in ſcripture, that the Apoſtles did ſo. Wée miniſter to women and lay men: becauſe S. Paule applieth Chriſtes inſtitucion to the whole congregacion of Corinth: where were both lay men & women. We celebrate vpon any day indifferently, becauſe the Apoſtles did ſo, *Actuum. 20. vno die ſabbatorum.* Wée miniſter to fewer or moe then twelue, by the example of the Apoſtles in. 20. of the Actes, and of Paule in. 10. and. 11. to the Corinth. Wée receiue in the mornyng, both becauſe time is a thyng indifferent in this ſacrament, and alſo for that wee haue plaine examples in the primatiue churche, without caſe of neceſſitie or extraordinarie chaunſes. Chriſte ſayd not do it after ſupper, as he ſayde, Deuide it amonge you. He did it after ſupper him ſelf: becauſe he wolde inſtitute the Sacramente of the new law, in place of the ſacrament of tholde law, that at the ſame ſupper he had celebrated. Neither is it ſo muche of the ſubſtance of the ſacrament to be done after ſuppper, as it is to be celebrated with companie: becauſe of the ſignificacion of vnitie and charitie amonge chriſtian men receiuynge together. Whiche is one cheefe poincte in this ſacrament of the Lordes ſupper. The very proporcion and likeneſſe of that ceremonie of the olde lawe, in place wherof the Lordes ſupper is ordeined, may teache vs the right vſe of it. The Paſſeouer was a ſolempne eatynge of the Paſcale lambe together in remembrance of Godes great benefite of their deliuerance and paſſyng of his plague from them. This ceremony they coulde not ſolempnice alone : but if they had not companie of their owne houſe, they ſhoulde take of their neighbours. Euen in like maner Chriſt, hauyng finiſhed at his laſte ſupper the celebracion of that ceremonie of the Paſſeouer, ordeined for his, euen a lyke ſacramente, a ſupper, a feaſt, wherin they, beyng together, might celebrate the remembrance of their redemption, by his body and bloud geeuen and ſhed for them. And euen as the Iewes in ſolempniſinge their ſacrament had a communitie of the remembrance of that benefite, when their cōpanies were in ſundry howſes ſeperate, and yet might not one alone eate the paſcall lambe in his owne houſe, for that god had ordeined it to be done with company : ſo all the churches in the worlde haue communitie in the ſacrament, bee they neuer ſo farre a ſunder : and yet can not any one alone miniſter it in one church withoute company to celebrate with him, becauſe Chriſtes inſtitution was otherwiſe. Wil ye ſay here, that company to eate vp the paſcal lambe was not of the ſubſtance of the ſacramente, but an ornament to commend it or ſet it forth, and might be altered by ſpirytual gouernours: Although the Iewes weare very bolde in altering many ceremonies, yet wée reade not, that euer they durſt aulter this chiefe ſacrament: as you take vpon you to alter, change and take away, by your ſpirituall gouernours, all the partes of the Lordes Supper: as I wyl declare to you in order by the doctrine of this your defenſe of pryuate maſſe. The ſacrament, as it is in vſe, hath two partes, the mattier, and the forme: the mattier is bread and the body, wine and the bloud of Chriſt. The forme of miniſtration is, that the miniſter ſhould take the mattier, and with the wordes of the goſpel geue it to them preſent, as Chriſt dyd. This forme (ſay you) may be altered by your ſpiritual gouernours. For ſometime the prieſte may receiue alone without the people, ſometime the people without the prieſt: ſomtime both together. So that no certaine forme of miniſtration is nedefull (as you ſay) in this ſacrament to be kepte. The matter alſo, ye ſignifie, may bee altered at your pleaſure. For, to receiue the ſacrament of the bloud, is not of the ſubſtance of Chriſtes inſtitution. For, if it weare, the churche could not alter it, as you do commonly in miniſtringe to the people, and as you coniecture by Tertul. and Ciprian, that they dyd in the prymatiue church. Likewyſe the ſacrament of the body is not ſo muche of the ſubſtance, but that vpon conſiderations the church may commonly omitte it, and miniſter the wine only. For ſo you ſeeme togather by the hiſtory of the chylde, in Ciprian, to whiche the prieſte gaue only wine, as you ſay. So that the ſacrament of the lordes ſupper, by your doctrine, either hath no parte, that is of the ſubſtance of it, but conſiſteth only of mutable accidences: or els your churche is of ſuch power, that it may cleane alter and take away Chriſtes inſtitution. For if you haue conſiderations, for which ye may commonly leaue out the wine, and vſe bread only: and other conſiderations, for which ye may omit breade, and vſe wine only: when bothe thoſe conſiderations come together, then may you take away bothe breade and wine, and defraude the people of the whole ſacrament, or in ſtede of that may point them another. What is this but, with exceding arrogancie, to make your ſpiritual gouernours omnipotent in alteringe and tranſpoſinge the ſacramentes by Chriſt ordeyned? Howe much more comely weare it for you reuoking your errour: to ſay with Ciprian. If we will walke in the light of Chriſte,

7. Cap.

A.

(in the order of his ſacramentes) we muſt not ſwarue or departe from his preceptes and inſtructions: geuinge thankes for that hee, inſtructinge vs what we ought to doe hereafter, doth pardon vs for that offence, which by ſimplicitie we haue before committed.

7. Cap. Where you indeuour to proue, that there may be communion in the ſacrament, although it be receiued alone: in thone part you make your compariſon (as you haue done before) betwene thinges of nature very dyuers: that is, betwene praier, and the lordes ſupper. In the tother, where ye confirme generall communion betweene all ſainctes, you proue that no man denieth. There A. may be communion in the benefite of prayer (ſay you) though one doe pray alone: therfore in the Lordes ſupper alſo. Who ſeeth not, that prayer and the Lords ſupper in the vſe of them be nothinge like: That praier is a common action, which, done of one alone, maye ſtretch to the benefite and commoditye of many, we haue authority in yͤ ſcrip-

ture, and example in Chriſte him ſelfe: but that the Lordes ſupper is ſuche a common action, we neither haue authoritie, nor example in gods worde. By as good a reaſon we may proue, that a man may baptiſe him ſelfe withoute a miniſter, becauſe one may pray alone without one to guyde him in the forme of his prayer: Or that ones baptiſme may profite another, that is not baptiſed: as a mans prayer may profite him that prayeth not. But you muſt conſider that there is greate difference betwene the nature of ſacramentes, and other common good workes. The ſacramentes haue an externall forme by Chriſte apointed in the adminiſtration of them: which we may not alter. In other good workes and godly exerciſes it is not ſo. And yet you recken them vp together, as though they weare in all poyntes like. As praier, baptiſme, penance, confirmation, faſtinges, almes dedes. &c. Another mans prayer or almes dede may profite you, I graunt, and procure gods grace for you. May an other mans baptiſme therfore receiue you into the church? or an other mans penance ſatiſfy for your ſinnes? I thinke you wyl ſcant affirme it, although ye be ready to affirme ſtraunge thinges. No more therfore can your receiuinge profite another, that receiueth not. Chriſt taught vs, and his holy worde commaundeth vs, to pray on for another. But he neuer ſaide receiue the communion, or bée baptiſed one for another. To confirme your purpoſe, you bringe B. an article of our crede: that is, I beleue the communion of ſainctes. By this you proue that there is a communion of all good thinges betwene them that are in place and time farre diſtante: which wee deny not. But to vnderſtande how lytle this communion of ſaintes doth ſerue your purpoſe of ſole receiuing, it behoueth to conſider what communion is. It is called of the Grekes, κοινωνία, and may be defined to be a ſocietie of a company or multitude, whiche, by certaine lawes and couenantes, are all partakers of one thinge. As amonge Marchantes, that vpon certaine condicions occupy iointly, and are partakers of like gaine and damage. So all Chriſtian men haue a certaine ſocietie or coniunction: whiche conſiſteth in this, that they are all partakers of one ſaluation, and all members of one miſtical body, the head wherof is chriſt Jeſu. The lawes & couenantes, wherby wee be all thus knit and ioigned together, are the word of God, & the ſacramentes vſed according to Chriſtes inſtitucion. Therefore all churches of the worlde haue the ſame worde of God, and the ſame ſacramentes: & by them through faith are graffed into one and the ſame body of Chriſte, thoughe they be thouſandes of miles a ſunder. By the word of God our faith is inſtructed: By baptiſme wee be receiued firſt into the ſocietie of chriſtian communion, and made members of the miſticall body. By the Lordes ſupper wée haue from time to time, heauenly fóode miniſtred vnto vs, and, as it were, liuely ſpirite from the head of this body Ieſu Chriſte. He therfore, that is baptiſed in India, hath the ſame baptiſme that wée haue: and, beyng graffed into the ſame body, hath communion with vs in baptiſme. Likewiſe they, that receiue the Lordes ſupper, be fedde with the ſame fóode of the body and bloud of Chriſte, that wée be: and ſo haue communion with vs in that ſacrament, though in place they be farre of. This is the communion betwéene chriſtian men: and this wée moſt reddely graunte. But will you conclude here vpon, that there is lyke communion of the benefite of ſóle receiuyng in priuate Maſſe, as there is of praier, when a man praieth alone? Then muſt ye ſay the ſame of baptiſme alſo. As for example, that our baptiſme here may benefite some, that are in Fraunce, and receiue them into the churche: like as our praier here may obteine the healpe and grace of God for them, that be there. Which were great folly to affirme. In deed wee haue communion in baptisme: but euery mans owne baptisme bringeth him the grace of that sacrament. And in lyke maner is it in the Lordes supper. Wee haue all communion therein: and yet euery mans owne receiuyng doth profit him. You will say perhaps, you doo not inferre this vpon the argument of generall communion, but onely that they, whiche be in diuers places, may communicate. Wel sir I graunte you that, but yet, ye should haue inferred the other pointe, if ye woulde orderly proue that ye began. That is, to be lyke comunion in the Lordes supper of one alone receiued, as there is in praier, when one man in place alone praieth for a multitude. The multitude, that praieth not, may haue benefit by one mans praier. But proue you by Gods worde, that one man receiuyng or miniſtringe the Lordes ſupper alone, doth benefit thoſe that receiue not, or that it is ſuche a thyng as may be done of no for many. And ſurely, it ſtandeth you vpon, ſubſtācially to proue that pointe, or els your priuate Maſſe will fall to the grounde, and bee of no eſtimacion. For if people ſhall vnderſtande, that your ſole receiuinge in your Maſſe doth not only nothing profite them, that be preſent: but (as Chriſoſtome witneſſeth) bringeth them in gods diſpleaſure, if they receiue not them ſelfe: thinke you that the gayne and aduantage thereof wyll bée ſo great, as hath bene before? Aſſure your ſelfe it wyl not. But what doo you inferre vpon this proofe of communion betweene them that are in place farre diſtante: forſoth in effecte, this. That if there may be communion betwene thoſe that are not together in one place: then a prieſt , ſayinge Maſſe in our Lady chappel in Paules at ſixe a clocke in the morning, doth communicate with him , that doth the like in Jeſus Churche at . ix. of the clocke the next day : although in place and tyme they bee ſeperate . Sir I deny your argument , & ſay that neither thone nor thother doth communicate with any Chriſtian man,becauſe neither of both receiueth accordinge to Chriſtes inſtitution. I confeſſe there is communyon betwene them, that receiue in ſundry places accordinge to the order by Chriſt apoynted,as there is likewiſe in baptiſme. But, if they alter the ſacrament, they do not cummunicate. I ſayd a litle before, that in the paſſe ouer all the companies of the Iewes in ſundry houſes did communicate, and yet one might not eate vp the lambe alone,becauſe god had taken an other order. Likewiſe all ſocieties of Chriſtian men communicate together in the Lordes ſupper: and yet ſhould not one celebrate it alone, ſeinge Chriſtes example ſheweth, and the Apoſtles interpretation declareth, that in miniſtringe of it, there ſhould bee alſo a particuler communion (as I may terme it) betwene the members of one congregation. Wherfore the grauntinge of communitie betweene all chriſtian men in vſe of the ſacrament, doth make nothinge againſt this, that Chriſt ordeined it to be receiued as a feaſt with company: to thende it might more liuely repreſent, both the general geuing and beſtowing of his body to death for many, and alſo the vnitie and concorde, that ought to be betwene Chriſtian men, receiuing together of one lofe and one cup. For this purpoſe, as S. Auguſtine ſignifieth, he vſed thoſe externall elementes of breade and wine: to declare, that, as the bread of many graines is brought into one lofe, and the iuice of many grapes is made wine in one cup, ſo the multitude of a chriſtian congregacion, receiuyng together the Lordes ſupper, are made mēbers of one body, knit together in like faith and charitie, and hauyng like hope of ſaluacion. The like effecte is doone in baptiſme (as S. Auguſtine witneſſeth *In ſermone ad infantes*) and wee be graffed into Chriſt and made partakers of his body and bloud. But he wold haue it more liuely repreſented and ſet forthe in this ſacrament of communion: as well for the multitude, as for the apte ſignification of the externall elementes. Moreouer the eccleſiaſtical hiſtories declare, when Chriſoſtome was baniſſhed, muche againſt the peoples heartes, that diuers of them woulde not communicate with his ſucceſſour, but had their aſſembles and receiued the ſacrament in an other place by them ſelues, ſo that diuers of them by the Emperours thretnynges coulde not be conſtreined to communicate with him, that was biſſhop after him. This ther doyng was to no purpoſe, if diuerſitie of time and place do not declare a ſeperacion betwéen them, that be of one congregacion. The whole vſe of excommunication in the primatiue churche doth ſo ſufficiently proue this, as no reaſonable man néedeth greatly to doubte it. The effecte wherof, this your deuiſe may ſéeme to take away. For what other thyng is excommunication (as touchyng the externall acte) then a debarryng of the partie to receiue with other of the ſame congregacion, and therby to note him not to be of that myſticall body. But after your deuiſe, a prieſt, that is excommunicated of the biſſhop, may ſay Maſſe in his chamber, and affirme that he will communicate with him, whether he will or no. Becauſe diſtinction of place maketh nothyng to the purpoſe. Becauſe wée neceſſarily require a numbre together, you preſſe vpon the matter very earneſtly,

neſtly, and thinke, by your dallying foly, to driue vs to many folies. For, you curiouſly require a meſure of place, a preſcription of time, and a certaine number of perſons: as it were therby to portray vnto you a perfit plat of a chriſtian communion (for ſo it pleaſeth you to dally in this weightie matter.) I anſwer that wee ſe in the Euangeliſtes and S. Paule, that Chriſte tooke breade and gaue with it his body: that he tooke wine alſo and gaue with it his bloud: that he did it in cōuenient place and time: that he had a company with him to receiue, and willed them to diſtribute amonge them. Therfore (with S. Cyprian) wee compte his example in theſe thynges neceſſarie, and not to be altered. As for the kinde of breade or wine, the faſhion or quantitie of place, the conueniencie of time, the increaſing or deminiſhynge of the number or company, wee recken amonge thoſe thinges that may be altered (as you ſay) by ſpiritual gouernours. But to apointe a geometricall meaſure of place, a preſcripte proportion of tyme, or one certaine number, that may ſerue for all churches, times, and ages, is far aboue our reache. And therfore I leaue it to be deuiſed of ſuche profound and curious braines, as you and yours haue. Which, beſide the worde of god, and contrary to his workynge in his creatures, can compryſe accidences without ſubiectes, and bodies withoute faſhion, quãtity or meaſure, with other ſuche highe miſteries, whiche neither ſcripture, nor any neceſſitie of reaſon doth teache. For in déede our wittes are ſo ſimple as, in gods miſteries, we can ſée no more, then his holy word leadeth vs vnto,

Nexte is, that you burden vs with 8. Cap. Eraſmus authoritie, and chalenge vs, that wée wyll not beléeue his reporte. Sir it séemeth very ſtraunge to mée, that you, whiche haue ſo muche hated

A.

Eraſmus, as ye haue often chaſed him out of grammer ſcholes, and dryuen him into the fire, ſhould now in your néede take helpe and ſuccour at hys hand. Truly wée do now eſteme Eraſmus, as wee haue alwayes, for a man of excellent learning, and a ſingular inſtrument prouided of god to begin the reformacion of his church in this latter time: and yet thinke wee not all his opinions to be true. For you, I thinke, do eſteme Tertullian and Origen and that right worthely. And yet if ye wyl graunt all, that they write, to be true: I wyl proue you an heritke. Notwithſtandinge we deny not that, whyche Eraſmus ſaieth in this mattier, and knew whens he had his aſſertion, before you tolde vs. How little it ſerueth your purpoſe I wyll ſhew hereafter. You confirme Eraſmus opinion with that Tertullian wryteth in his .2. boke Ad Vxorem, of the Paynimes wife that was Chriſtened, and euery day priuely

Anſwere to Eraſmus, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Ciril.

A. receiued the ſacrament at home in her
houſe. And alſo with the hiſtory that
Ciprian rehearſeth of the woman, that
vnreuerently opened the cheſte, where
in ſhee kepte the Lordes body. To this
alſo ye adde Cirilles aucthority for re-
ſeruation. Out of theſe places you
ſucke not onely ſoole receauinge, but
alſo myniſtringe vnder one kinde, re-
ſeruation, yea, and reall preſence al-
Of ſoole receiuing. ſo. Firſte, for ſoole receiuinge, it
behoueth to conſider, that in the time of
B. Tertullian, Ciprian, and all that age,
the church was in much trouble, vexa-
cion, and perſecution: ſo that they could
not haue their eccleſiaſticall aſſembles
and congregations for common praier
and miniſtracion of the ſacramentꝭ ſo
conueniently, as afterwarde in time of
peace. For euery Paynime, eſpecially
if his wyfe, childe, or ſeruaunt, were
tourned to Chriſtianitie, was ready
and ſought occaſion to bewray them,
and bringe them in trouble (as it may
appere

appere by the ſame booke of Tertullian that you alledge). Therfore they were oftentimes compelled of neceſſitie to ſend the ſacrament to ſuch as were abſent, and either durſt not or might not conueniently come: as ye may perceiue by Iuſtine the Martir that the faſhion was in his time. Hereof it came, that dyuers receiued alone in their houſes. But nor theſe places, nor any other, that you be able to alledge, can proue, that there were miniſters or prieſtes priuately celebratinge with other ſtandinge bie, that receiued not. That, whiche theſe perſons receiued at home, was parte of that was diſtributed in the common celebration where company were: and, vppon caſe of neceſſitee, ſent by the miniſters to them beinge abſent. But you ſhould bringe ſuch places, as might proue, that the common miniſter, in place of the lordes ſupper, dyd celebrate and receiue alone, other beinge preſent and not partaking. For ſuche a ſole receiuinge is your pryuate Maſſe, that you pretende to ſtriue for. Now therefore let vs ſee, how aptely your argument, gathered vppon theſe places, doeth conclude your purpoſe. Women and lay men ſomtime, in caſe of neceſſitie, priuately receiued at home parte of that, which was ſent from the common celebration: therfore common miniſters, as often as they liſte, oute of neceſſitie may conſecrate, and receiue alone in the common place of prayer, when the people is preſent, and doth not communicate. I thinke your ſelfe may eaſely ſe, of what force this collection is. That may be graunted to a lay perſon receiuinge, that may not to a pryeſt miniſtringe: that ſometime in neceſſitie, whiche may not alwayes at pleaſure: that at home where none is, that may not in the church where many be. Wherfore theſe teſtimonies are but weake groundes to builde pryuate Maſſe vppon. You wyll perchance ob-

iecte,

ſecte, that ſuch receiuing in houſes was vſed, when the churche was in quiet, and without perſecutiõ. I graunt you, (as the maner is) that facions, brought in by neceſſitie or ſome greate conſideration, be oftentimes kept and folowed with abuſe, when neither neceſſitie doth conſtraine it, nor good conſideracion can mainteine it: and ſo was it in this matter. Hierome againſt Iouinian mencioneth, that in his time ſome vſed to receiue in their houſes: but he earneſtly inueigheth againſt that maner. Why (ſaith he) doe they not come into the church? Is Chriſt ſometime abrode in the common place, ſomtime at home in the houſe? &c. In Socrates the.2. boke, we reade, that Sinodus Gangrenſis condemned Euſtathium for that, contrary to the eccleſiaſtical rules, he graunted licence to cõmunicate at home. So that hereby it may apeare, that a cuſtome, that, in neceſſitie, to ſome perſons, is eyther tollerable, or pius error: is at another time, and to other perſons vntollerable and *Impia prophanatio*. If you dilygently examine that maner of receauinge in theyr houſes at that tyme, which ye thinke to make with you, you ſhal wel perceiue it not a lytle to make againſt you. When they did celebrate (as Iuſtine before rehearſed doth witneſſe) they dyd not only diſtribute to them, that were preſente, but, by the deacons, ſent it to ſuch, as could not be preſent. Did they not in this point declare a neceſſitee of partakinge, if it were poſſible, at euery miniſtratiō? In ſo muche that when their place would not receiue all, or other neceſſary cauſe did let them to come to the common place of prayer: yet, that they might be partakers of the Lordes ſupper, they ſent it to them where they were. How well doth this faſhion agree with your priuate maſſe? Wherin ye neither cal, nor proffer, nor ſend to the people; but ſo do it all alone in ſight of the hole congregacion, as though it weare a thinge, that nothing appertained vnto them. Now then you may euidently ſe, that none of theſe authorities, hetherto alleged, doth proue directly your Maſſe: that is a ſole receiuinge in the celebration of the ſacrament. But how neceſſary that time of the churche dyd thinke it to bee, that the people ſhould bee partakers with the prieſte, that Epiſtle ſignifieth, that you attribute to Anacletus: where it is this wrytten. *Peracta conſecratione omnes communicent, qui noluerit eccleſiaſticis carere liminibus. Sic enim apoſtoli ſtatuerunt, & ſancta Romana tenet eccleſia.* After conſecration (ſaith hee) let all be partakers, which wil not be excommunicate. For ſo the Apoſtles decreed, and the holy churche of rome obſerued. The ſame wordes by ſome are attributed to Calixte. Do you not heare excommunication threatned to all, that do not communicate? Do you not heare that the Apoſtles decreed it, and the holy church of Rome obſerued it? And wil you yet ſtand ſo ſtubburnly in your aſſertion, that there was priuate maſſe in the primatiue church? Wil you haue better witneſſes of that time then Iuſtine, then Dioniſius, then Anacletus, then Calixte, then the other holy fathers before mencioned? would Ambroſe haue blamed the people for not reſortinge to the ſacramente dayly? Would Chriſoſtome haue ſaide, that they, which be preſent and not receiue, do wickedly and impudently? Would they haue commonly vſed (as Iuſtine ſaith) to ſend to thoſe that could not be preſent, if Chriſtes inſtitution and the maner of the prymatiue churche had ben ſuch, that the miniſter might celebrate alone without callinge or offeringe, and people without offence bee preſent and not communicate, as you of longe time haue vſed it? Surely ſay what you wyll, and alledge as ofte as you liſte the aucthoritee of your holy mother the churche of Rome ſo many hundred yeres: I thinke very few, that haue feare of god and care of their ſaluation, wyl geue credite vnto you. Eſpecially ſeinge you can bringe no better teſtimonies for your purpoſe, then in this defence you haue vſed.

Agaynſt cōmunion vnder one kinde.

An other poincte, that you picke out of theſe authorities of Tertul. and Cyprian, is for miniſtrynge vnder one kinde: wherein wée haue the inſtitucion of Chriſte expreſly againſt you, as wée had in the other. For in the Euangeliſtes and S. Paule wée ſe teſtified, that Chriſt toke breade and gaue with it his body: and afterwarde toke the cuppe and gaue with it his bloud, and willed them to obſerue & vſe the ſame. Here you muſte of neceſſitie flée to your olde place of refuge: that is, that, to receiue vnder bothe kindes, is not of the ſubſtance of the ſacrament, but ſuch a thynge as may be altered by ſpirituall gouernours. For Chriſtes bodie (ſay you) is not without his bloud, & therfore he, that receiueth his body vnder forme of breade, receiueth his bloud alſo, *Per concomitantiam*. Therfore you ſay the people is not defrauded of that Chriſtes will was, that they ſhoulde receiue, yea and, for good conſideracions & honorable to the bloud of Chriſt, they receiue it more conuenient then vnder bothes kindes. O profounde and déepe ſette reaſon, wherin you ſéeme to make your ſelfe wiſer than Chriſte him ſelfe, that ordeined the ſacrament. While you will ſéeme with your gay gloſes to glorifie the bloud of Chriſte, you cleane take away the right forme and maner of his ſacramente. Theſe are the vanities wherwith God iuſtly doeth puniſh you for your raſheneſſe in leauyng his worde and folowyng ẏ phantaſies of your owne braine. But it ſhould haue béen your obedience to Goddes worde to conſider, that the communion of Chriſtꝭ body and bloud is not the worke of nature in this Sacrament. For, what ſo euer is here geuen in theſe thynges, is to be taken by faith: and is offered to vs in the wordes of Chriſtes promiſſes. So much is geuen vs as God appoincted to giue. Of whoſe will and pleaſure wée know no more, then his wordes declare vnto vs. But Chriſt (as I ſaied) tooke two partes of the ſacrament: in one of the whiche he ſaied wée ſhoulde be partakers of his body: in the tother of his bloud, and lefte his preſcripte and appoincted wordes, as well for the tone as for the tother. Wherfore wée muſt more truſt him than mans ſubtill deuiſe. You alledge a perpetuall ſocietie of the body and bloud, whiche ye call *Concomitantiam*. It is your owne deuiſe and not Chriſtes promiſſe in his ſacrament. In Chriſtes naturall body, that is in heauen, I know his fleſh is not without his bloud. But in the ſacramente, whiche is no naturall worke, how will you aſſure me, that the fleſh and bloud is ioinctly ſignified and geuen to mee vnder one parte onely: ſeyng Chriſt himſelf, who knew, as wel as you, the ioincte condicion of his fleſh and bloud, did not withſtandyng, in two ſundrie external thinges, geue the communion of them to his diſciples. Therefore the faieth of the communicantes in the tone parts receiueth the body of Chriſte, truſtynge to Chriſtes promiſſes: The ſame faith in the other parte receiueth the bloud, beléeuyng alſo our ſauiours wordes therin. It hath reſpecte to Chriſtes wordes and promiſſes, it looketh not how the body and bloud is in Chriſte naturally. What grounde ſhal our faith haue if we leaue the worde of God? Oh ye will ſay our holy mother the churche hath ſo ordeined it. Yea, but I ſay to you, that, if your mother the churche of Rome be the folde of Chriſte, and if the ſhéepe therof be his ſhéepe, they will heare his voyce and obey his worde. If they do not, alledge the name as ofte as ye wyll, I will ſay you be ſheepe of an other folde and not of his. For he ſaith, *Oues meæ vocem meam audiunt*. He ſaith not they heare them ſelfe & their owne deuiſes, but they heare my voyce. Remember what Cyprian ſaith. Only Chriſte is to be hearde in this. And wee muſt not looke what other did before vs, but what Chriſte did before all other. When we doubt, we muſt haue recourſe to the order taken by Chriſte and by the Apoſtles in their wrytinge. But ye will ſay the churche hath aucthoritie to alter diuers thinges eſpecially beyng indifferent, and not of the ſubſtance of the ſacramente. Yea but Cyprian ſaith the preceptes of this ſacrament bee *Grandia & magna*. And if he be called leaſt in the kingdome of god, that altereth one of the leaſt commaundementes, what ſhalbe ſayd of him, that taketh awaye theſe great and weightie commaundementes. Ciprian wrate againſt thoſe that were called Aquarij, waterdrinkers: which vſed only water in ſtede of wine in the miniſtration of the ſacrament. But they offended not ſo much as you doe. For they altered only the licour, and that vppon holy conſiderations. They kepte the wordes and promyſſes of Chriſte. But you take away the one parte cleane, and leaue out the wordes and moſte comfortable promyſſes of Chriſtes bloud to bee ſhed for vs. If then Cyprian were ſo earneſt againſte thoſe vſers of water in ſtéede of wyne, how muche more earneſt woulde hee haue ben againſte this maner, if it had ben common in his time? Here, thoſe places that you recite may ſéeme to helpe you, and to make againſte vs. For, where Tertullian ſpeaketh of the Paynimes wife, hee mencioneth bread only. And whē Ciprian reporteth that the woman kept the lordes body in her coffer, it may ſéeme to be vnder one kinde. Theſe are but coniectures, and the ſame very vncertaine. For oftentimes in the doctours, where one kinde is mencioned, both are vnderſtanded, as after ſhal moze appere. But to make this moze pzobable: you alledge afterwarde oute of Ambzoſe the hyſtozie of *Satyrus* his bzother, that hanged the ſacrament aboute his necke in a ſtole (as you call it,) when, in a ſhipwzake, he leaped into the ſea: whiche muſt néedz be in fozme of bzead onely, becauſe neither our bzayne noz yours can deuyſe, which way wyne can be in ſuch an inſtrument incloſed. Surely if wée had not knowen befoze, that you had nothing in the aunciente fathers directly to mainteine your maymynge of Chziſtes ſacrament: this your coniectural gatherynges and ſurmiſinge reaſons woulde moſt euidently declare it to be true. Woulde a man thinke that any, hauyng the feare of God, woulde in ſo weightie mattiers, either grounde his owne conſcience, oz ſéeke to confirme others by ſuche féeble pzoofes and argumentes?

gumentes? Is not this a ſtronge reaſon thinke you? *Satyrus* S. Ambroſe brother, in extreame danger of ſhipwrake, purpoſing to leape into the ſea, tooke of one, that was in the ſhip, only the ſacramente of the Lordes body, and tied it aboute his necke: therfore in the primatiue churche in miniſtration of the ſacramente they gaue onely one kinde vnto the laytie. Though it had ben here mencioned that *Satyrus* had, in this extremitée, receiued one kinde alone: it had bene no argument to proue, that it might orderly bee vſed in the churche. But (as Ambroſe ſignifieth) this *Satyrus* at that time was, but, as I might ſay, a nouice in Chriſtian religion, not ſo farre inſtructed in the faith that hee was as then admitted to the communion of the Lordes ſupper. And therfore hee had not the ſacramente aboute him ſelfe, but tooke it of other chriſtian men, that were there. Which whether they were miniſters or other, the place maketh no mencion: but that it calleth them, Initiatos. That is, ſuch as in the congregation were admitted to the communion. Neither is there any thinge to the contrary, but that the ſame perſons, whiche had the ſacrament of our Lordes body, had alſo aboute them the ſacrament of the bloud, either in ſome conuenient veſſel, or els after ſome other faſhion, as dyuers of ſimplicitie vppon a zeale at that tyme vſed. That is either by ſokinge the ſacramente of the body in the wyne, or els by moyſtinge a linnen cloth in the ſacrament of the bloud, and ſo carying it with them. For, euen as I ſignified before, that perſecution and trouble of the churche at the beginninge draue ſome to receiue at home in their houſes: in like maner the ſame troublous time, and other caſes of neceſſitie with feruencie of zeale, cauſed men to ſeke other ſhifts alſo, and to do thoſe things by ſimplicitie vpon zeale at a time, that in the common vſe of the ſacramentes they coulde not do accordinge to the worde of god. Therfore as ſome learned and holy mē for the time did winke and beare with ſuche thinges: ſo afterwarde other euen as holy and profoundly learned did miſlike and reproue the ſame. As for example, when men did trauaile any daungerous iourney, and for zeale and deuotion would haue the ſacrament with them: becauſe they could not conueniently cary wine with them, that they might go as nighe to Chriſtes inſtitution as might be, they would ſoke the ſacrament of our Lords body in the bloud. Some other would moyſte a linnen cloth in the ſacrament of bloud (as I ſaid before) and kepe it to moyſte with water when they would receiue. Some, that either of nature could not, or for religion would not drinke wine, at other times vſed only water. Some vppon other conſideracions vſed milke for wine in the ſacrament

ment. Some were perſwaded that in ſuch caſes men might vſe one kynde. Wherfore to ſicke men or children they would vſe wine alone. But the particular caſes of a few, ought not to be taken for a general rule of the holy churche. Neither thoſe thinges, which ſome did (as Ciprian termeth it) vppon ſimplicitie by ſufferance, ſhould be brought as teſtimonies, what the church either then did, or ought nowe commonly to doo. For a man may well doubte whether theſe ſhiftes, that men in neceſſitie did vſe beſide the inſtitution of Chriſt, were acceptable to god or no, although dyuers of them might ſeeme to procede of a feruent zeale, and to bee done of good and godly men. It appereth in Cyprian, that many of them, that vſed water for wine, were godly men: and yet by zeale and ſimplicitie did erre. Therfore hee ſaith of them in this manner.

If any of our predeceſſours either by ignorance or ſimplicitie did not obſerue and kepe that, whiche the lorde by his example and inſtruction did teach vs to doe: by gods mercy his ſimplicitie may be pardoned. But we cannot be forgeuen, which be inſtructed & admonyſhed by the lorde to doe as he dyd. &c. The godly and holy fathers dyd beare in many poyntes with the zeale and ſimplicitie of a number, in that tyme. Wherfore thoſe examples cannot bee brought iuſtly to proue the common maner vſed in the primatiue churche, which by manifeſt teſtimonies I wyll a lytle after declare to haue be farre otherwyſe in the ſame times, that theſe thinges were done. That the ſame thinges, before rehearſed, were not generally allowed, it may appeare by this, that, when the church was ſetled, they did forbid thoſe things, and bound them, ſo nigh as might bee, to Chriſtes inſtitution. Hereof ye haue example in Iulius his decrées. 4. Hom. Conc. Wher all the faſhions before recited are expreſſely forbidden. Wee heare (ſaith he) that ſome led with ſchiſmaticall ambition, in the diuine miſteries doe conſecrate milke for wine,

wine: ſome ſerue to the people the ſacrament of the body moyſted in the bloud, as a perfite communion: other offer in the ſacramente of the lordes cuppe, the iuice of grapes ſquyſed: ſome diepe a linnen cloth in the wine, and kepe all the yere. Therefore (ſaith he) henceforth it ſhal not be lawful for any in their ſacrifice to offer any other thinge, but only the cuppe mixed with water and wine. *Gelaſius* alſo after him euen as flatly forbad receiuing vnder one kinde: ſayinge. We finde that ſome takinge a portion of the lordes body refuſe the cuppe: whiche, becauſe I know not of what ſuperſtition they doe it, either let them take the whole ſacramēt, or be kept from the whole. For the diuiſion of this miſtery cannot be without great ſacrilege. Here you ſée that *Gelaſius* doth count it and cal it ſacrilege to receiue vnder one kinde: and your ſorte contrary to this, affirme it to be Heriſie, if a man ſay the people ſhould receiue vnder both kindes of bread and wyne. If you would rightly haue proued your miniſtringe to the laytie in one kynde: you ſhold not haue brought coniectures vppon ſuche rare chaunſes, as may ſeeme for the tyme to be borne with, rather then alowed: but you ſhould haue ſhewed ſome playne and euident examples, that it was in the primatiue church commonly vſed in celebration of the ſacrament. But that you were neuer able to doo, and ſo was it ſaid in the proteſtation, that you call the challenge. For herein the whole number of the fathers be againſt you. And that you may not iuſtly ſay, that wee bragge of our empty boxes, that haue the name only, and no ſtuffe in them: I wyll rehearſe and ſhewe you ſome of yͤ mattier, which ſhalbe directly applied to that maladie and diſeaſe, that you haue brought to the right vſe of the lordes holy ſacrament. You hard before rehearſed oute of Iuſtine declaringe ths maner of the church of Rome in his time, that both bread and wyne were geuen to companies of the towne and contrey, and the ſame alſo ſente vnto thoſe, that were abſent. Here is manifeſtly declared, that ſuch as were abſent, and receiued at home in theyr houſes, had both kindes ſent vnto them, contrary to your coniecture vpon Tertullian, where (you ſay) one kinde only is mencioned and therefore receiued. Tertullian and Iuſtine were both of the church of Rome, and were not in time farre a ſunder. Therfore it is like one maner was vſed in bothe theyr ages. B. The fleaſh (ſaith Tertullian him ſelfe) is fed with the body and bloud, that the ſoule may be filled of god. He ſaith not only the body, wherein the bloud alſo may be vnderſtanded: but hee addeth ſeperately the bloud. Declaringe the maner of Chriſtes ſacrament miniſtred in two ſundry partes. Cyprian alſo ſpeakinge not only of prieſtes, but of other laye men, that were like to abide perſecution and martirdome for Chriſt, ſaith in this wiſe. How doe wee teach and prouoke them to ſhedde their bloud in confeſſion of Chriſt, if wee deny them his bloud: or howe make we them meete for the cuppe of martirdome,

tirdome, if wee do not firſt by communion admitte them to drinke the cuppe of the lorde? C. Is not this a playne teſtimony, what maner of myniſtracion was vſed in Cyprians time? And wyll you then, vpon a ſurmiſe, gather the contrary? If ye rede this father in all places, where he ſpeaketh of the ſacrament: you ſhall finde nothinge more common, then, *Bibi ſanguinem Chriſti*. How wilte thou (ſaith Ambroſe to Theodoſius the Emperour) with thoſe handes receiue the holy body of our lorde? how wilte thou be ſo bolde, with thy mouth to be partaker of the lordes bloud.

E. This Emperour was a layeman: neyther is it likely, that he receiued any otherwayes, then the other people did at that time. And ſhall wee thinke by a vayne coniecture of the hiſtory of Satirus, that the cuſtome of that time was otherwiſe, becauſe your mocking head could not deuiſe how to cary wyne in a ſtole? and yet they of that time (as ye may perceiue by dipping a linnen cloth in the ſacrament of the bloud) had deuyſed which way it might be done. But to our purpoſe. Withoute confuſion and doubt (ſaith Gregory Nazienzene) eate his body and drinke his bloud, if thou haue any deſire of life in thee. And yet hee ſpeaketh to the people, Oratione. 4. in ſanctum paſcha. Hilariꝰ alſo. li. 8. de trinitate. Theſe thinges (ſaith hee) beinge eaten and dronke make that wee be in Chriſt and Chriſte in vs. Baſile de baptiſmo, vpon theſe wordes. As often as ye ſhall eate. &c. What profit haue thoſe wordes (ſaith he)? That we eating and drinking may be perpetually mindeful of him that died for vs: and ſo may bee inſtructed in the ſight of god and his Chriſt, of neceſſitie to kepe the doctrine deliuered by his Apoſtles. Here, beſide the mencion both of eating and drinkinge, he addeth, of neceſſitie to kepe this doctrine of the lordes ſupper: whiche you in many poyntes, without pricke of conſcience take vppon you to aulter. Pryſtes (ſaith. S. Hieronime vpon Sophon) whiche make the ſacrament and dyſtribute the bloud of the lord vnto the people. This man was prieſt in Rome in Ambroſes time: and yet he ſignifieth, that

E. the maner then was to myniſter the bloud to the people. And ſhall the hiſtory of Satyrus, nothing perteining to the mattier, perſwade vs the contrary? What can be more plaine and expreſly againſt you, then that Chriſoſtom hath Hom. 18. in poſter. ad corinth? There he ſaieth, that in this ſacramente the prieſtes parte, is not better then the peoples. For it is not (ſaith he) as it was in the olde law, where the prieſtes had parte and the people parte: neither coulde the people be partaker of that was the prieſtes. But now it is not ſo, for one body and one cuppe is indifferently offered to all. And it is notable that he ſaieth. All be like worthy to be partakers, neither doth the inferiour differ any thing at all frō the prieſt in that matter. Why dow you then (ſo plainly againſte Chriſoſtome) make difference of dignitie betwéene the prieſt and the people? Is not this, which Chriſoſtom ſpeaketh agaynſt, one of the chiefeſt reaſons, that you haue for the geuynge of one kynde to the people? But S. Paule to Timothie and Titus, declareth other cauſes that ſhoulde make the order of miniſterie honorable: & not to defraude the people of one parte of yͤ ſacrament. Cyprian againe, in the ſame ſermon De lapſis, that you afterward aledge, and the ſame Hyſtorie, ſheweth, that all the companie of lay men and women tooke the ſacrament of the Lordes cuppe and dronke of it in order, one after an other. But I feare I ſhal ſeeme to moſte men to commit muche foly, in that I ſtande ſo longe with authorities to proue that thinge, whiche of it ſelfe is moſt manyfeſt: that is, that in the primatiue churche the only maner, in the common celebracion of the ſacrament, was, that all receiued vnder bothe kindes of breade and wyne. Seynge therefore Iuſtine ſaieth, that on ſundaies breade and wine conſecrated were diſtributed to companies of the towne and countrey, ſeynge *Gelaſius* calleth it ſacrilege to deuide the ſacrament; ſeynge *Cyprian* counſelleth that lay men ſhould be admitted to the communion of the Lordes cuppe, and by an Hyſtorie ſheweth that in his time they vſed it: ſeynge Chriſoſtome affirmeth no difference to be betweene the prieſt and yͤ people in vſe of this ſacramente: ſeyng all the reſidue of the fathers of al countreyes and all ages of the primatiue churche agrée to the ſame, were it not more then willfull blindeneſſe not to ſe, that holy men at that time in celebracion of the ſacramente miniſtred both partes to the people, accordyng to Chriſtes inſtitucion and the doctrine of S. Paule to the Corinth? Were it not almoſte deſperate ſtubburneſſe to perſwade the contrarie to ignorant people, and by libelles priuily ſpred to deteine the vnlearned in errour? But it ſtode you vpon to ſay ſomewhat, leaſt you ſhoulde ſéeme to haue nothynge to ſay. And yet in very déede it had been better for the confirmacion of your doctrine to haue ſayd nothyng. For then perhaps ſuch, as of ſimplicitie depende vpon your aucthorities, woulde haue thought, that you had had farre better prouiſion for your defence in ſo weightie mattiers. Which now, ſeyng your ſclender and féeble groundes, will beginne, I doubte not, as they haue the feare of God, to miſtruſt your dealyng, and more diligently examine the reſidue of your doctrine. It is not good for them any lenger to walke on other mens féete, nor to be guided by other mens eyes, but them ſelfe to ſe what way they go: leaſt their guides, either by ignorance or wilfulneſſe, leade them into the pitte of continuall errour.

Of reſeruacion.

The third poincte, that you gather out of theſe teſtimonies, is reſeruacion of the ſacrament: which to deny (ſay you) is extreame impudencie. I thinke you haue not mette with any, whiche haue flatly denied; that in the primatiue churche diuers vſed reſeruacion. But it foloweth not therevpon, but that a man may deny without any impudencie at all, either, that wée haue any teſtimonie in the worde of God to iuſtifie it, or, that all the holy fathers did approue it. Or if ye wyll ſay the contrarie, I wyll not doubte to make the crime of impudencie, that you charge vs withal, to rebounde vpon your ſelf. But you will ſay, you haue witneſſe that it was vſed, and that of good men, whiche is ſufficient. Indéede it is ſufficient to ſhew, that it was then vſed: but it is not ſufficient to proue, that it muſt therfore be alwayes vſed: or, that all did well at that time in vſing of it. Oh ye will ſay, this is your olde maner, ſo longe as the fathers make with you, you wil admit them: if they ſéeme to be any thynge agaynſt you, ye will reiecte their authoritie. Becauſe, you cōmonly take holde here, and, through this odious reporte, often vſe to ſtirre mens ſtomackes agaynſt vs: before I anſwere your reſeruacion, I will pro-

What authoritie is to be attributed to the doctours.

teſt

tell what authoritie wée attribute vnto the olde fathers. This will I do not with my owne wordes, but S. Auguſtines in his epiſtle to Hierome. I confeſſe that I haue learned to attribute this reuerēce and honour only to the canonical ſcriptures, to beleeue ſtedfaſtly without controuerſie all, that is written in them. As for other I ſo reade them, that, be they neuer ſo excellent in great holynes and learnyng: I do not therfore counte it true, becauſe they were of that opinion: but becauſe they coulde perſwade me, either by ſcripture or good reaſon, that it was not againſt the truth. Here you may obiecte that men, of ſuch learning, holineſſe, and deuotion, woulde neuer haue written any ſuche thynge, if they had not thought it to be agréeable with Gods worde. Ye ſir, I thinke they as good men, were ſo perſwaded: but that they did leaue in writyng many thynges, not onely beſide the worde of God, but alſo againſt it, I thynke it is not vnknowen to you. And that other alſo may know it, and therby holde vs excuſed, when wée doo not in all poinctes agrée unto them, I will recite ſome proufes therof. Clemens Alexand. with Iuſtine and diuers other taught, that Angels fell from their eſtate for the carnall loue of earthly women. Whiche doctrine, I thinke, you wil not ſay riſeth of true interpretacion of the ſcripture. The ſame Clement, Strom. 2.&.6. writeth, that mens ſoules are transformed into Angels, and firſt learne a thouſande yeres of other Angels: afterwarde teaching other new transformed Angels, at the length become Archangels. Whiche can not be ſoundly taken out of the ſcriptures. Iuſtine, Lactantius, Iræneus and other wrote, that good men, after the reſurrection, ſhoulde liue a thouſande yeres in all ioye before Chriſte ſhoulde come to iudgement. And yet is that but a miſunderſtandynge of the ſcripture. Tertullian ſéemeth to attribute a bodily ſubſtance to God and in diuers places tes, De trinitate, ſpeaketh dangerouſly of Chriſte: for whiche, and like thinges, many would haue had his workes counted Apócrypha. Therfore he doth not alwaies agrée with ſcripture. Cyprian would haue Heretikes to be rebaptiſed, and ſpeaketh ſo dangerouſly of them that are fallen from the faith, that he might ſéeme to geue ſome occaſion to Nouatians hereſie. What ſhall we ſay of Origine, in whom be founde ſo many perilous doctrines, as both I, in this place, am loth to rehearſe them, and in the primatiue churche diuers greate learned men woulde haue had his bookes burned for the ſame. I coulde ſay the like of diuers other, but that I feare ſome will maliciouſly gather, that I rehearſe theſe thynges of purpoſe, ſo muche as in me lieth, to deface the authoritie of the holy fathers. Which, God is my witneſſe, I meane not: but onely to ſignifie, that, when wee meaſure their doctrine by Goddes wordes, or teache not in all poinctes as they did, wée be not ſo muche to be blamed as that men ſhould counte vs, as you doo, to controlle the doctours, and as it were to ſet them to ſchoole. For if God hath ſuffered them to erre in ſo weightie mattiers as is before mencioned: (although for good cauſe I haue omitted the greateſt) it may be alſo, that they haue taught amiſſe in ſome other lighter thinges, and therfore are to be reade with iudgement, as Auguſtine counſelleth bothe in himſelfe and in other. Nothwithſtandynge wée doo greatly eſtéeme the fathers: not only as holy mē indued with ſinguler grace of God: but alſo as right good witneſſes and ſtrong defendours of the chiefe articles of our faith, at that time, when Sathan indeuoured, partely by crueltie of perſecution, partely by infinite numbers of Hereſies to deface and extinguiſhe the ſame. Therefore who doth not muche honour them, & (when trueth conſtreineth) with reuerence go from their opinion, is ſcantly worthie the name of a chriſtian mā. Neuertheleſſe, I think not yͤ contrary but, if they had ſéene, what abuſes and ſuperſticions woulde haue folowed vpon diuers thynges, that they either taught, or for the ſtate of that time winked at and ſuffered: vndoubtedly they woulde either haue recanted thoſe thinges, as Auguſtine did many, or els would haue made a more perfit interpretacion of their mindes. Before the Pelagians Heriſie beganne to be ſpredde, S. Auguſtine ſo wrote of frée will, as he ſéemed not to himſelfe afterwarde, ſufficiently and as the trueth required, to expreſſe the mere grace of God. Therfore, vpon occaſion of that Heriſie, he writeth more perfitly of that and of predeſtination, then either the other doctours do, or, then it is to be thought, that himſelfe would haue done, if that occaſion had not been. So doubteleſſe

Of reſeruacion.

D.

both he and many other woulde haue done of diuers thinges now in controuerſie: if at that time they had been brought in queſtion. This much by the way haue I ſpoken of my opinion in the doctours, ſo muche as I can, to eſchew the malicious reporte, that your ſorte is moſte readie to ſpreade of vs in this mattier. Now I wyll returne to reſeruation. Wee denie not (as I ſayd) that ſome, in that time, did vſe it, as it appereth by your witnes of Ciril. As touchinge whoſe wordes by you in this place recited, I haue this muche to ſay: that, as I know the ſame place is alleaged of dyuers other, and therfore I wyl not plainely deny it: ſo, becauſe that worke of Ciril is not extante, I haue good cauſe to ſuſpecte it. And ſo muche the more, for that diuers of your ſorte haue alleaged oute of the ſame doctour in his worke Theſaurus, certaine wordes for the ſupremicie of the Byſhop of Rome, whiche are not there to be founde. This vniuſt fatheryng of your owne late deuiſed phantaſies, vpon the auncient doctours and writers of the churche, may cauſe vs iuſtly to ſuſpecte the reſidue of your doyng. But be it ſo, that thoſe are Cirils owne wordes indeede. Wee haue for that one ſuſpected place a number of ſounde teſtimonies, that all did not alow reſeruacion, nor thinke it accordyng to the worde of God. Origine vpon the .v. chap. of Leuiticus. The Lord (ſaith he) deferred not the breade, that he gaue to his diſciples: ſaying, take and eate: neither commaunded it to be kepte vntill the morow. The reſidue of his wordes, vpō the ſame place, be ſuche, as he ſeemeth thervpon to gather an argument, that it ſhould not be reſerued. Hee, that wrote the ſermon De cæna domini in Cyprian, ſaieth plainely of the ſacrament, Recipitur non includitur. It is receiued, it is not incloſed or ſhutte vp. Iſychius vpon Leuiticum, at large declareth, how that in his time, if the miniſters and people were not able to eate vp ſo muche as was conſecrated, the reſidue was bourned, and cōſumed by fier, that it might not be kepte vntill the nexte day. Therfore you may not force vpon vs to receiue reſeruacion as a thyng either grounded in ſcripture or generally alowed by the primatiue churche. What will you ſay to your ſeconde Epiſtle of Clement byſſhoppe of Rome. Let ſo many holy loues (ſaith he) be offered vpon the aulter, as may be ſufficiently for the people. If ſo be any ſhall remaine, let them not be kepte vntill the morow, but, with feare and tremblyng, let the miniſters eate it vp. This was a Biſſhoppe of Rome, this was Peters ſucceſſour, this was (as you ſay) head of the churche: and yet you heare his appoinctmente and order taken expreſſely againſt reſeruation. If ye will not beléeue vs, why doo you not beléeue your owne? Will you ſay, with your teſtimonie of Ciril, that Origine was madde, that Iſychius was madde? Or if ye be not afrayde to ſay it of them: Will you ſay that Clement was madde alſo? Well ſir, if ye wyll proue vs impudent or madde for not receiuynge reſeruacion: I truſte you ſe, that wee ſhal haue company in our impudentie and madneſſe. But Clementꝭ Epiſtle preſſeth you harde in ſole receiuynge and priuate Maſſe alſo, and ſignifieth that all the miniſters receiued together with the people. For, in the wordes before rehearſed, he ſpeaketh of the Maſſe that was vſed, when that Epiſtle was made: and yet it willeth you to prepare for the people. Why doo you not folow his auctoritie in theſe poinctes? You will ſay, as you ſayd in the beginning, if the people be abſente, and, when the ſacramente is prepared, either will not or can not come to receiue, Clement then ſayeth not that the prieſt conſecratyng ſhould forbeare, becauſe thother bidden gueſtꝭ will not come. The churche (you will ſay) did alway profeſſe a communion, if any woulde diſpoſe them ſelfe. I anſwere. Fyrſt, if Clement bad you prepare for the people: Why do you contempne his Cannon, and on the holy day, when a number be preſent, neither call them, nor prepare for them. If the churche alwayes profeſſed a cōmunion, why haue you one Prieſte ſtandyng at the aulter alone, with one ſingyng cake for himſelfe, whiche hee ſheweth to the people, to be ſéene and honoured, and not to be eaten? Where haue you auctoritie or example for that? Haue you that in the ſcripture? Haue you that in the doctours? Haue you that in the auncient counſels? If you haue ſhew it vs, and wée wil, without any more reſiſtence, géeue ouer to you. If you haue not, dreade the wrath of God, for géeuynge the occaſion of ſo muche ill to the ſymple people.

Secondly, if the people wyl not come, when the ſacramente is prepared, the prieſte alone ought not to communyeate. For Paule wylled the Corinthians to tary one for another, and not euery man to preſume to eate his owne ſupper, as I ſaid before. Then (ſay you) if the people wil neuer receiue, nor the prieſte ſhall euer receiue by occaſion of the peoples ſlacknes. As I haue repeted once or twyſe before, ſo I ſay nowe againe: that, to proue your caſe of neceſſitie, you imagine ſuch an impoſſibilitée, as cannot lightly happen among a Chriſtian congregation rightly inſtructed: So that, if ſome of the people wyll not at conuenient times receiue with the miniſter: the faute is in the miniſters and prieſtes them ſelfe, that ſhold inſtruct and teach them. Wherfore leaue the imagine of a caſe welnere vnpoſſible, and amend your faute of not admoniſhinge and callinge the people at your priuate Maſſes.

9. Cap. Anſwere to Euſebius and Nicene counſaile.

Your nexte proufes are the hiſtory of Sirapion in Euſebius lib. 6. ca. vltim: who, lyinge in his death bed, was ſerned with the ſacrament alone. And alſo the .xii. Canon of Nicene councel, whiche prouideth alſo for them that were in diſpayre of life, that they lacked not their neceſſary viage prouiſion. Out of theſe places alſo you gather ſole receiuing, and that vnder one kind.

A. Theſe chaunſes alſo, that you here in this place recite, bee either caſes of neceſſitie or great difficulty, as your ſelfe confeſſeth: and therfore cannot inferre any generall maner, that either then was, or now ſhould be vſed in the common miniſtration of the ſacramente.

B. But neither the hiſtory nor yet the cānon ſpeaketh generally of all that lye in their death bed, but only of one ſorte, that before were reſtrained from communion, which they called penitentes. For the maner of the primatiue church was, if a man had, either in perſecution, forſaken the faith, or otherwyſe greuouſly offended, that before he could be receiued to the communion againe, he had a time of penance apointed him: as.3.4.or.5.yeres, more or leſſe as the mattier required. If it happened that, before his time of penance was finiſhed, hee were at extremitie of death: then hee ſhould haue the ſacrament geuen him, leſt he ſhould departe excommunicated, and as one that was not of the church and miſtical body of Chriſt. For this extremitie, whiche then was very common and often, to ſatiſfie mens weake conſciences, they were, in the primatiue church, driuen almoſt of neceſſitie, both to ſuche kinde of ſole receiuinge, and alſo reſeruinge of the ſacrament. Of this ſorte was that Serapion, that you ſpeake of. Of this ſort doth that twelfe canon ſpeake, as it may appeare in the other goinge before. Now, in this neceſſitie and extremitie, if they admitted ſole receiuynge: Is it a proufe that they vſed it in the common celebration of the ſacrament, as you do? By as good reaſon you may proue, oute of the ſame hiſtory, that it were no abuſe, to haue boyes and chyldren to miniſter the ſacramente commonly: becauſe, in that extremitie, Sirapions boye delyuered him the ſacrament, which the pryeſt ſent. Surely in this your maner of defendynge priuate Maſſe, wherein you ſhew your ſelfe to be able to bringe nothing for the mainteinance therof, but only extraordynary chanſes in extremitie and neceſſitie, you do much bewray the euyl vſe of it: and manifeſtly declare, yea and as it weare proteſtée, that in déede it is euel and without all authoritie or example of the primatiue churche, if you bee not dryuen to it by neceſſitie and lacke of communicants. You wyll reply perhappes and ſay, by theſe examples it may appeare that company in receyuinge is not of neceſſitie, or if it had ben they would not haue vſed the contrary. Yes ſir, neceſſitie and extremitie may cauſe ſome kinde of gods commaunde-

ments

mentes at times to be omitted, and yet out of neceſſitie the ſame commaundementes ought neceſſarely to bee obſerued and kepte. The Jewes were commaunded on the Sabboth day to doo no bodely or toylinge worke. Neuertheleſſe ſometimes we rede, that, by neceſſitie of there enemies conſtreined, they kept warre and fought on the Sabboth day. Yet can you not ſay but that commaundement was neceſſary. I ſayd the like before of baptiſme: and the ſame muſt I ſay in the lordes ſupper: that a caſe of neceſſitie may perhappes for a time, alter ſome neceſſary parte of it: and yet not bee taken for any generall rule. Therfore if ye wyll receiue alone in your Maſſe, or miniſter vnder one kinde: you muſt neuer doo it but in extremitie: otherwyſe your proufes helpe you nothinge at all. Yea but in the hiſtory of Sirapion but one kinde is mencioned, and reſeruation manifeſtly appeareth in that it was ſo ready to bee delyuered to the meſſanger. If in they reſeruation (which they vſed for caſes of extremitie) they did kéepe only one kinde, that is not to be taken for a perpetual rule in the celebration of the ſacrament, as I haue dyuers tymes rehearſed: eſpecially ſeinge all the doctours, when they ſpake of the common receiuinge, ſignifie, as I haue before declared, that, accordinge to Chriſtes inſtitution and doctrine of the Apoſtles, they vſed both bread and wine.

A. All be it I haue hetherto ſo aunſwered you, as I may ſeme to graunt your gathering of miniſtringe vnder one kinde vpon this place of Euſebius: I may not omitte to aduertiſe you, that you picke more oute of that place, then by the wordes ye are able to iuſtifie. For in déede the words ſéemeth more to make againſt you, then with you. Parum Euchariſtiæ (inquit) puero dedit, iuſſitq; vt id infunderet & in os ſenis inſtillaret. He gaue to the boy a ſmall porcion of the ſacrament of thankes geuing, and bad hym ſtiepe or ſoke it, and power it ſoftly into the olde mans mouth. Here note you that, Euchariſtia, comprehendeth both bread and wine, by the witnes of Iuſtine in his apologie. Where, after hee hathe ſhewed, that both bread and the cuppe ouer whiche thankes were geuen was diſtributed to all preſente, hée addeth: Hoc alimentum apud nos vocatur Euchariſtia. This noriſhment is called the ſacrament of thankes geuinge. Wherefore the prieſt in this place gaue to the boy a ſmal porcion of both partes: and, becauſe the ſicke and féeble man, who had lyen thre dayes ſpeachleſſe, was not able to receiue bread drie, he willed the boy ſo to ſoke the ſame in the wine, as he might power both ſoftly into the olde mans mouth, and ſo hée did. That it was this, the wordes infudit and inſtillauit doth declare: whiche could not bee done without lycour: Neither is it likely that the prieſte would wyll the

boy

boye to ſoke the ſacramente conſecrated in a licour not conſecrated: And eſpecially if he were of your opinion in tranſſubſtantiacion. This may you ſe by your owne place, that in reſeruation they vſed often to kepe bothe kyndes: Which might wel ſtand with the maner of that time, wherin they did euery day communicate: ſo that the wine alſo might well tary vntil the next day.

10. Cap. Anſwer to the. xiiii. Cannon of Nicene counſell.

The. xiiii. cānon of Nicene councel in no ſence doth proue ſole receiuinge, as you would haue it ſéeme to do. It apointeth who ſhould miniſter, and in what order they ſhould receiue: firſte the byſhop, then the prieſtes, after the deacons, and ſo forthe other that dyd communicate. This order takē by that holy counſaile maketh ſo plainly againſte the manner of your pryuate Maſſe, as I aſſure you, I meruaile, that you coulde for ſhame alledge it. Who ſeeth not by this teſtimony that all the miniſters vſed commonly to receiue together with the byſhop beynge preſent: Here was not my lorde at the high aulter, and the reſidew of hys chaplaines and prieſtes in ſundry chapels celebrating by them ſelfe: but all receiued together deacons and all: that it might appere to bee a heauenly feaſt or ſupper, and not a worke or ſacrifice to be done of one to the behouſe and benefite of a number, that ſtande by and loke on. The councel ſpeaketh not here in this poynte of any extraordinary chaunce, as it doeth in that parte that you alledge, but of the common ordynary maner which by the authority of the ſame councell was apointed to bee vſed in the church. If we had lacked teſtimonyes for the trueth againſte pryuate Maſſe: wee had bene muche beholdinge to you, for puttinge vs in minde of this place. I thinke, ſuch as fauour your aſſertion, wyl ſmally thanke you for bringing in this councel. But thanked be god, that you are driuen ſo much to your ſhiftes, as you cannot maynteine falſhodde, but that you are conſtreined withal, to promote the trueth. Where you ſay that deacons, in the abſence of the byſhop and prieſtes, might them ſelfe take forth the ſacrament and eate: there appereth an extraordinary caſe, as was in Sirapions boye miniſtringe. But yet it ſaith not Ipſe proferat & edat. Which would haue made gayly with you: but, Ipſi proferant & edant. Wherfore here is no cloke at all to couer your priuate Maſſe or ſole receiuinge, but all expreſſely againſte it. For, albeit there be no lay people here mencioned to receiue, yet you vnderſtande all the miniſters receiued together. Notwithſtanding this place proueth not, but that the people at the ſame time vſed to receiue with the miniſters. For the byſhop, prieſtes, deacons, with the reſidewe of the clergie and the people alſo communicated all together at one time. But for orders ſake the prieſtes and clergy ſtode together, and the lay people alſo by them ſelfe, and receiued after the clergie. Therfore ſhal you ſometime reade that certaine of the clergy for puniſhment, as it were diſgraded, were reiecti in laicam communionem, that is, inioyned to ſtand with the lay people at the communion. In handling of this place, where as in deede all the argumentes that you haue brought are nothing but writhinges of extraordinary caſes, yet, as though you had great ſtore of ſtrong and vnuincible proffes, and ſuch as no man can ſtande againſte, you woulde ſeeme to yelde vnto vs, of your owne righte: and, vppon a confidence of your cauſe, as it were to geue vs an argument, that you could wringe out of this cānon, for receiuinge vnder one kinde. In deede ſuche bee the reſidew of your wreaſtinges, and therfore you mighte haue placed this amonge them as one of the chiefe. By the like argument, yea

A.

and better to, you may proue, out of the ſame place, that prieſtes alſo receiued but only the body and not the bloud: becauſe: it ſaith, Corpus chriſti porrigant, and mencioneth not, Sanguinem The like you ſhall reade in many places of the olde fathers, where one part only is mencioned when they ſpeake of the prieſtes receiuinge. And yet bothe are vnderſtanded. If you wil vpon this gather, that deacons vſed but one kind: I wil inferre vpon the ſame place, that prieſtes alſo vſed the like maner. But a reaſonable man wyll eaſely conceiue that in ſpeakinge of one parte, both is vnderſtanded. For in the actes of the Apoſtles the whole celebration of the ſacrament is termed breakinge of breade: wherby we muſt not gather that Apoſtels vſed only bread in miniſtration of the lordes ſupper. I meruaile why you make ſuche courteſy to recite this for a proufe of one kinde then vſed, ſeynge the beſt of your collections for this matter be euen of the ſame ſorte. Is not your coniecture out of Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambroſe, euen in the ſame maner gathered: For that they ſéeme to mencion but the one parte onely: And yet you make ſuch a bragge vpon them as you count all ſuch to lacke diſcretion as wil not by and by without contradiction yelde vnto them, and acknowledge them vnuincible. In déede it ſtandeth you vpon, ſeinge your proufes are of them ſelfe ſo ſclender, ſomewhat to helpe them with ſtoute wordes: that men may bee almoſt afrayde to doubte of them. You obiecte to vs that we dalley, when wee preſſe you with the wordes of Chriſtes inſtitution: Accipite, manducate, bibite, diuidite: and yet you wyl vrge the wordes of the fathers, as though euery ſillable in them were in like maner to be ſcanned as the wordes of the bible, written wholly by the inſpiration of the holy ghoſt. But in déede you declare of what authoritie B.

you coumpt Chriſtes wordes, that eſtéeme it a dalleinge to repete often his commaundementes. Did Cyprian thinke you, dally, when, in one Epiſtle, to Cecilius, hee doth well néere .xx. times repete and beate vpon this: that the ſacrament is to bee miniſtred in no other maner then Chriſte him ſelfe did vſe it? Did hée dally when hée preſſed vpon the matter in this wiſe: If in that ſacrifice, that is Chriſte him ſelfe, none but Chriſt is to bee folowed: then muſt wee obey and do that Chriſt did, and willed to be done. When as he in his goſpel ſaith, if you do that I byd you, then I call you not ſeruantes but frendes. And that Chriſt is only to be heard, his father wytneſſeth from heauen ſayinge, This is my deare beloued ſonne, hym you muſt heare. Wherfore if onely Chriſt is to be heard, we muſt not geue eare what other dyd before, but what Chriſt did before all. Neyther muſt wee folow mens cuſtome but gods trueth: ſeinge he ſaith by his prophet, in vaine they worſhip me teachinge mens tradicions and doctrines. And againe, the lorde ſayth in the goſpell, you reiecte my commaundmente for your owne tradition. And in another place, he, that breaketh one of theſe leaſt commaundements and ſo teacheth, ſhall be called leaſt in the kingdome of god. If then it be not leeful to alter one of the leaſte commaundements: how much leſſe may we alter ſo great and weightie commaundements, as theſe are, ſo nigh touchinge the ſacrament of the lordes paſſion and our redemption: or to tourne them to any other purpoſe, by mans tradition, then the lorde ordeined them. Theſe are not my ſayinges, but worde by worde as they lie in that holy father: and wyl you ſay that hee cauilleth or dalieth, when hee this vrgeth Chriſtes inſtitution to bee kepte: and would haue nothinge therin to be altered for any cauſe, that man coulde deuiſe. The matter, that hee wrate againſte, was of no more effecte, then theſe are of ſole receiuinge and miniſtring one parte of the ſacrament: and yet is he ſo earneſt, as you ſee, with a greate number of wordes mo to the ſame purpoſe. Thinke you not, they could haue brought for the vſe of water only the examples of holy men, and alſo goodly conſiderations in apperance: Yes certainly that, and it is to be gathered in Cyprian that ſuch were alleaged. But hee crieth ſtill we muſt folow Chriſt, and do as he did, and no otherwiſe. The trueth is therefore of this your cauilling, that Chriſtes wordes and inſtitution is ſo flat agaynſte you, as you haue no other ſhifte to eſcape, but either, ſo to imminiſhe and debaſe the weight of Chriſtes commaundements, as they may appere but indifferent counſailes; or ſo to amplifie and extoll the churches power, that the ſame, vppon gaily deuiſed conſiderations, may aulter and take away thoſe thinges, that hee hath apointed to bee vſed. Remember how earneſt you haue ben in magnifiynge your owne tradicions. As, that the ſacramente can be conſecrated after no other facion, then you haue ſet forth in your maſſe. In that the leauinge away of one veſtiment, albe, tunicle, ſtole, the omitting of one knelinge, croſſinge, or other like geſture, is coumpted a heinous matter. And ſhal it then be eſtemed a cauilling or dalcing, preciſely to require the ſame to be vſed accordinge to the maner by Chriſte the authour, taught and ſet forth in the holy Euangeliſtes: This is it that Chriſte ſayd to the Phariſies, that they magnified theyr owne traditions, and left vndone gods commaundementes. Repete you as ofte as you liſte againſt vs, that we cauille when we vrge Chriſtes inſtitution: and you ſhall heare as ofte at our hande, that you worſhyp god in vaine with your traditions: when you departe from his holy worde.

11. Cap. Anſwer to Cyprian De *lapſis*.

As touchinge the hiſtory that you recite oute of Cyprian, De *lapſis*: you make mee doubt, of dyuers thinges, which I ſhold thinke moſt true: either, that you had not ſeene the place your ſelfe, but as you found it peecemeale recited of ſome other, ſo to haue vſed it: Or els, that you thought vs ſo vnſkilful and negligent, as we neither knew the place, nor would ſeeke to examine it: Or laſtly, that of purpoſe you dyd abuſe the ſimplicitie and ignorance of them, that you conueighed your wrytinge vnto: which commonly beleue all that you ſay without examination: and therfore doo you alledge for your ſelfe, that maketh expreſſely againſte you, if yͤ place be red: which in Cyprian is in this wiſe. The childe beinge among the holy company, was not able to abide our ſuffrages and prayers: But the ignorāt ſoule in the ſimple and yonge yeares, ſometime with wepinge and cryinge did ſtrike: ſometime with trouble and anguyſhe of minde toſſed hether and thether: and as it were by a tourmentour conſtreininge it, by ſuch meanes as it coulde, dyd confeſſe the gilte of the facte, (meaninge the eatinge of the Idolle offeringe) And, when the reſidew of the celebration was ended, the deacon began to offer the cuppe to them, that were preſent: and after other had receiued and the childes courſe was come: the babe, as it weare by inſtitucion of god, tourned away the face, held the mouth and lippes together, and refuſed the cuppe. Yet the deacon

con continued, and, although the infant ſtryued againſte it, poured ſome of the ſacrament of the lordes bloud into her mouth. Then folowed yexing and vomiting. &c. Here were gathered together with Cyprian, not prieſtes only but lay men, women, and Children alſo: and you ſee the cuppe of oure Lordes bloud was offered to all, and all dranke in order withoute exception. Neyther is heare any thinge, that by coniecture can leade a man to thinke otherwyſe, but that this was the common maner then vſed. How than can you gather by the extraordinarie chaunce, whiche you recited before out of the ſame Tertullian and Cyprian, that the laytie then vſed to receiue the one kinde of breade onely: whereas this place, brought by your ſelfe, ſheweth, that, in celebracion, they vſed the cuppe alſo. The childe you ſay in this hyſtorie receiued but wine only, and ſo one kinde. That you make probable, becauſe the childe, that had receiued the Idoll offeryng, was not vexed, before the Deacon gaue hir the wyne. But this reaſon is plaine againſt Cyprians wordes: who ſaieth, the childe was wonderfully vexed, ſo ſone as they began to pray. Therfore, by this place, you can no more gather, that the childe receiued only wine, then Cyprian him ſelfe and the reſidue of the company. But if it were ſo, is it not moſte euidente, that it was, either becauſe the childe was ſo yonge, that it coulde not, or ſo troubled, that it would not take the ſacramente of the body: And ſo at that time did of neceſſitie, whiche otherwiſe he woulde not haue done. Why, ye will ſay, my purpoſe was to proue no more, but that in neceſſitie one kinde might be vſed. Although I ſhould graunte you that, yet it foloweth not but at other times of neceſſitie both partes of the ſacrament ſhould be taken. For, I haue diuers times ſaid, that neceſſitie hath no law: and may cauſe a commaundemente of

God to be omitted : whiche, out of that extremitie ought of neceſſitie to be kept vnderpains of Gods diſpleaſure. By this Hyſtorie, it is playne, how neceſſarie that time did thinke it, that all preſent ſhould communicate with the miniſters. Seyng the Deacon woulde not ſuffer ſo muche as the litle Infant to go without ſome parte: althoughe ſhe ſtriued againſt him, and ſcantely coulde force hir to take it. This maketh againſt the faſhion of your priuate Maſſe: Where, not Infants and chilchildren, but other miniſters and the reſidue of all the congregacion ſtande lookyng on, and no man receiueth, nor is prouided for, but onely one prieſte, that conſecrateth and receiueth all him ſelfe. Your handlynge of this place of Cyprian, may be a ſufficient proufe to all men, how ſoundly and truly you interprete other mens writinges, and how ſincerely you iudge of them, that is, by violence as it were to ſtreine them to ſay that whiche they neuer ment. In like maner you doo a litle after in Luther and Melancthon, ſaying that they compte it a thing indifferent to communicate the laye people vnder one kinde: and that a generall counſel may take order in it as a thynge of no neceſſitie. Sir it had been plaine and ſounde dealing, that you ſhuld haue recited ſome place wher they had ſo ſaid: but that ye were not able to doo. For any man that hath ben conuerſante in their workes, may right well iudge that it is not ſo. I wil not trouble you with looking on many places. There is a little treatiſe of Melancthons intituled De vſu integri ſacramēti: in which ye ſhall finde diuers argumentes concludyng the neceſſitie of bothe kindes, and that they ſinne and greuouſly offende, that doo reſtraine the people from one parte of the ſacrament. But I perceiue this is your cōmon faſhion, to make Doctours & writers to ſpeake whatſoeuer you woulde haue them to ſpeake.

12. Cap.

A.

Now ſir, if ye haue no better proufes and teſtimonies oute of the holy ſcriptures and olde fathers, then theſe whiche ye haue in this your Apologie alledged: I aſſure you, the challenge, that before was made, may iuſtly be againe repeted. And, it may be ſayde to you, that you haue out of the ſcripture nor ſillable nor tittle: out of the auncient doctours nor ſentence nor halfe ſentence, that doeth directly proue eyther your priuate maſſe or communion vnder one kinde to the laitie. For all, that here you haue vttered, be nothinge but wrythed coniectures vpon caſes extraordinary, and ſhiftes of extremitie, to proue a continual or general rule to bee obſerued in the church of Chriſte, contrary to the example and order by hym ſelfe apointed! Wherefore there is no cauſe, that you ſhould ſo confidently conclude, as though you had profoundly ly proued the matter, and geuen vs, as you ſay, an occaſiō to diſcuſſe and more curiouſly to examine the reſidew of our doctrines. Thinke you not but the meaneſt of a great number in this realme (although they ſeeme but babes and children to you) haue knowen a greate deale more, then you haue heare alledged: and could haue ſpoken better for you, then you haue yet for your ſelfe. And yet, when they had all ſaid, it had ben nothinge in compariſon of the very

B. trueth. It is but a toyletie in you that ye do ſo rolle vp the names of doctours: ſayinge, Tertullian is agaynſte you, Cyprian is againſt you, Euſebius is againſte you. &c. As though you had alleaged oute of euery one of them a number of teſtimonies for the declaration of their mindes: wheras you haue brought out of them all but a fewe bie ſentences, of whyche, the more parte make nothinge againſte vs, and ſome

C. expreſſely with vs. Theſe be the titles of the emptie boxes that you do vſe to bragge vpon. But as you wil ſay, your boxes are not altogether emptie: ſo wil I anſwere, they haue but little good ſtuffe in them: and ſome of them conteine medicines contrary to the dyſeaſes, that they are applied vnto: whiche is the parte neither of good phiſition nor true Apothecary. A good phiſition, when the body is troubled with diuers diſeaſes, will ſo indeuour to cure and heale the tone, that hée do not exaſperate and hurt the tother. But you, by Chriſoſtome, Cyprian, and Nicene counſel, in ſuch ſorte helpe reſeruation: as, by the ſame, you cleane marre your priuate maſſes, and miniſtringe vnder one kinde to the laytie. Neither wyl I euer thinke, that the beſt and greateſt learned of your clergy can bringe much better ſtuffe oute of theyr ſtore of the doctours, then you haue done. Wherefore theyr bondes of recogniſance and poſſeſſion of the trueth (as you ſai) hath ben faire clokes for them to holde their peace, where as in déede they haue in these poinctes or litle or nothing to ſay for them ſelfe. And ſurely, if I had ben of your ſorte, I would haue wyſhed, that you alſo had ben bounde in recognisance, if that would haue ſtayed you from wrytinge. For both your reaſons and authorities by you vttered, though they ſéeme to your ſelfe neuer ſo ſtrōg, doth rather bewray your parte, then pithely defend it. But if you and yours had neuer ſo greate ſtore of armour, prouiſion and furniture, as to the terrour of men, you would pretende to haue: yet ye ſhold neuer be able to beare downe the manifeſt trueth, ſo euidently apperinge in the wordes of Chriſtes inſtitution; nor the wytneſſes of the primatiue churche agreinge with the ſame. Therefore the thunderinge in of the authoritie of the holy catholike church, the preſcription of .xv C. yeres, the conſent of moſte parte of Chriſtendome,

Anſwere to the argumente of multitude, contin[uance] of time, &c

dome, the holines and learninge of ſo many godly fathers, as hath béen theſe ix.C.yeres, the age and ſclender learninge of thoſe that ſtande againſt you, doth nothinge at all either feare vs or moue vs to ſuſpect that doctrine, which, by Chriſtes authoritie and witneſſe of the Apoſtles, wée know to be trewe. We haue ben accuſtomed of longe time to thoſe vaine voices. Wée ſée they all be either manifeſtly falſe, or at the leaſt of ſmall effecte. Theſe are the myſtes, which you haue alway caſt before the eies of the ſimple and ignorant, as it were to blinde and amaſe them: to the ende, that either they may not ſée the trueth, when it is brought to them: or, if they ſée it, to make them ſuſpecte it, when they heare that .xv.C.yeares the more parte of the worlde haue bene of contrary opinion. But this is euidently falſe, that you ſay. For .600.yere after Chriſte & more, theſe doctrines were neuer heard of in the church, much leſſe receiued and alowed. Yea and in the time folowynge, neither dyd they ſo ſone take place, as you would haue them ſéeme to do: and when they were roted, god ſtéered vp from time to time diuers in all ages, that reproued them. Therefore you cannot iuſtly bragge of quiet poſſeſſion ſo longe time. But by your ſpirituall powers, that occupied the place of the church, ſuche men were diſgraced, and their doctrine and bokes aboliſhed, and, ſo much as mighte bée, brought oute of memory. And on the contrary parte, by pernicious flatterers, the workes of auncient fathers corrupted, other new workes and Epiſtles forged in their name: that by this meanes your doctrine, whiche is but newe in déede in comparyſon of trueth, might haue a face or viſarde of antiquitie, thereby the ſoner to créepe into mens conſciences. Shal we thinke that your Donation of Conſtantine, and a number of Epiſtles, attributed to the auncient biſhops of Rome, be their true monumentz? Doth not the barbarouſnes of the ſtile, the repugnancie to the hiſtories & writers of that time, the vnfitte wreſting of places of holy ſcripture ſo euidently appeare in them, as a childe almoſte may perceiue them to be forged, and not to agre with the ſpirite of the primatiue churche? Be not your ſelues aſhamed of yͤ counterfaite Donation of Conſtantine, wherwith the ſee of Rome a longe time blinded the princes of the earth, and made them almoſte ſlaues vnto it? Be not there a number of places in your decrees fathered vpon the olde doctours, whiche eyther be not in them at all, or els otherwiſe then they be there recited? And, ſhal we thinke then, that trueth hath ben ſo longe on your parte: when forgeing and falſhodde hath moſte mainteined your doctrine? Adde to this, that Grece, and all the Eaſt churches neuer receiued priuate Maſſe, communion vnder one kinde, prohibicion of mariage in prieſtes, purgatory, the ſupremacie of Rome, nor a number more of your errours. Yea and at this daye thinke and do contrary to you in thoſe thinges. And wyll you then ſo falſely beare men in hand that the whole churche was always of your opinion? But be it ſo, that the moſte part of chriſtendome. ix. C. yeres hathe taught as you do. Is that a ſufficient argument to reiecte a doctrine euident by the worde of god? May not all chriſtianitie be cleane defaced, if ſuch argumentꝭ of continuance of time and multitude of perſons ſhould be rules to gouerne mens conſciences? Might not the gentiles haue alledged the like againſte the Apoſtles and their ſucceſſours? Might not they haue ſaide, and ſaide more truly then you, that the worſhipping of their gods had continued, not hundreds, but thouſande of yeares? that the whole worlde helde with them? that the wiſe and profound learned Philoſophers defended their doctrine: that the Apoſtles were but new heretikes, Ideotes and vnlearned perſons: that their doctrine came from the dotinge people of the Iewes: that the gods declared their dyſpleaſure and indignations againſt the new teachinge of Chriſt, with ſeditions, tumultes, warres, plagues, dearthes, tempeſtious weatheringes, and ſuche like: Might not the Iſraelites haue coūted greate folly in the houſe of Iuda, that they would ſwarue from theim in worſhippinge of god: ſeinge they were tenne partes to one: Might not the prieſtes in the olde lawe, yea dyd they not alledge againſt the prophetes, continuance of time and multitude of doctours, prieſtes and Rabins: Were they not hundredes to one poore Micheas? Did they not the like in Chriſtes time? Did they not beate vpon the longe continuance of Moyſes law: whiche, they ſaide, he came to deſtroy: Did they not deface him for his age, his birth, hys maner of life: and for that he taught otherwiſe then a number of the godly, wiſe, and holy phariſies: which in thoſe daies had as great opinion of holynes of life, and deepe learning, as the beſt of your religious monkes or obſeruant friers. Might not the Turkes for continuance and multitude, make a gaye face for the confirmation of Machomets law? Might not they ſay, that it hath continued .x.c. yeres, yea and that with great ſucceſſe and proſperitie, as it had bene by a ſinguler prouidence of god? May they not ſay and to truly affirme, that they haue .x. for one Chriſtian? May they not ſay, that it is not likely, that god would ſuffer ſuche a number of nations and cou̅treis to erre ſo many hundred yeres? Haue they not in many partes of their religion ſuche apparant deuotion, as they may ſhame vs chriſtian men? And yet is all moſte euidently falſe, and gods trueth remaineth ſtedfaſt: although it binde it ſelfe neither to continuance of time, nor to perſon, to place, to number, to this colour of life or to that in iudgement of the world: but is gouerned by his dyuine & inſcrutable prouidence. Wherfore theſe reaſons make no more for you and againſte vs: then they did for the Iſraelites, againſt the Iewes: for the prieſtes, againſte the prophetes: for the Iewes and gentiles, againſt Chriſt and his Apoſtles: for the Turkes, againſt vs Chriſtians at this day. Yea but, you will ſay, the holy catholike churche of Chriſte teacheth otherwiſe, whiche is the witneſſe of trueth, and cannot erre: eſpecially in thoſe thinges that appertaine vnto our faith. For Chriſt hath promiſed, that he will neuer forſake his church vnto the ende of the world, but guide it with his ſpirite. And his ſpirite is not the ſpirite of errour, ignorance or darkenes, but of trueth, wiſedome, and light. Wherfore

To theis obiection of the churches aucthoritie.

none can forſake the guidinge and inſtruction of our holy mother the church, without manifeſt perill of their owne ſoules, and ſuch as they doe leade from the church. In déede this accuſation is greuous, and may not lightly be paſſed of mée, although you ſtaie not longe vpon it. This is that you feare mens conſciences withall. This is it that in déede maketh many to ſtagger in receiuinge the trueth: when they heare you continually beate vppon the name of your holy mother the churche, and in wordes claime that to you, whiche verely and in déede is not in you. For all be not the ſonnes of Abraham, that bragge and auante that they came of Abrahams ſtocke: All be not the people of god, that ſay, they bee the people of god: All be not Iſraelites, that diſcended of Iſrael: All be not Chriſtian men in déede, that name them ſelfe Chriſtians. I will therfore in few wordes declare what the church is, and howe we may, if we take not good héede, be deceiued by the name of the churche, takinge the church of Antichriſt, for the true and right churche of Chriſte. Firſt, how neceſſarie indéede it is for a chriſtian man to beléeue the faieth of the holy church, it may by this appere, that to be borne to euerlaſtyng life and ſaluacion, to be made the ſonne of God and heire of the kyngdom of heauen, of neceſſitie wée muſt be conceiued in the wombe of the churche of Chriſte, and, as it were, foſtred vp in hir lappe. For ſhe is the mother of all thoſe, that are the true children of God: And in hir cuſtodie Chriſte hath lefte the treaſure of his grace, by hir miniſtery to be beſtowed amonge his people. Therfore if wée couitte to haue entrance into the kyngdome of God, and be partakers of the graces and promiſſes of Chriſte, I confeſſe wée muſt remaine in the faith of his holy churche. But what is this churche, or how may it be knowen?

What the churche is and whether it may erre.

66.

Forſoth the ſcripture ſpeaketh of the churche of Chriſte two waies. Some time as it is indéede before God, & not knowen alway to mans iudgemente. Into this church none be receiued, but onely the children of grace and adoption, and the very members of Chriſte by ſanctifying of the holy ghoſt. This church doth not comprehend only holy men and ſainctes liuyng on the earth, but all the electe from the beginnynge of the worlde. This churche is the piller of truth, that neuer continueth in errour. This churche is neuer forſaken of the ſpirite of God. This is the holy communion of ſainctz that in our Créede wée profeſſe and acknowledge. But this church, as after ſhall appere, doth not alwaies flowriſh in ſight of the worlde. Sometime the churche is taken for the vniuerſal multitude of al thoſe, whiche, beyng diſperſed through the worlde, acknowledge one Chriſte, and, beyng through baptiſme admitted into the ſame, by the vſe of the Lordes ſupper openly profeſſe the vnitie therof in doctrine and charitie. Sometims the churche is taken for the multitude of thoſe that beare rule in the churche. This churche is reſembled to a nette, whiche caſte into the ſea, bringeth vp both good and badde. It is reſembled to a feilde, that hath not only pure corne, but alſo Cockle, Darnell, and other wéedes. And as wée often ſe, that good corne in ſome groundꝭ is ſo choked vp, and ouer runne with wéedes, as the good graine may hardly be deſerned, for that the wéedꝭ beare the chief rule: Euen ſo in this churche the euill and corrupted doth ſometime beare downe the better ſorte, that a man can hardly iudge, whiche be the true members of the churche, whiche are not. This churche therfore, for the moſt number, may be miſled, and in many thinges ſtray out of the way. This church may erre, and not continually abide in pure

Obs.

and vncorrupte worſhippyng of God, as I wil now with good proufe farther declare vnto you. God hath had this his externall churche from the beginnyng of the worlde, inſtructed by his holy worde, inſtructed by his Patriarkes and Prophetes, inſtructed by his apoincted law and ceremonies: and ſo continued till the commyng of his dere ſonne Jeſus Chriſte. This churche he calles his ſpouſe, his tabernacle, his priuie garden, his loued citie, his electe and choſen vineyard. But did it alway continue in floriſhyng eſtate? Did it alway in like maner retaine the truth of Gods worde, that it was taught in the beginnyng? Did it alway cheriſh and mainteine ſuche miniſters, as God ſent from time to time into it, to redreſſe and reforme his law accordyng to his holy will? In what ſtate was this churche in Noes time, when. viii. onely were ſaued? In what ſtate was it, when yͤ. x. Tribes forſake the right worſhipping of God, and lefte onely the Tribe of Iuda? In what ſtate was it afterwarde, when ẏ ſame one Tribe of Iuda vnder diuers kinges fell to Idolatrie? In what ſtate was it, when Elias pitifully complained, that he onely was lefte, and all other were departed from God? Where was the externall face of the church at that time? In what ſtate was it when Eſaias, Ieremie, Ezechiel, and al the Prophetes of God were perſecuted & put to death? I pray you was not Iurie then called the people of God? Had they not at that time the lawe of God? Did not they vſe his ceremonies? Did not they bragge and make their auaunte that they coulde not erre? that the trueth coulde not departe from the mouthe of their prieſtes and doctours? that they had the temple of God, the temple of God? Yes certainely they had euen then the law of God. They had euen then the ſacramentes and ceremonies by God appoincted : or els the Prophetz would neuer haue vſed their temple or companie of their praiers and ceremonies. Yet how miſerably the law of God and his ſacramentz were corrupted among them, it appereth by that Eſay ſayeth: The ſiluer of the people of God is turned into droſſe. How they intertained the meſſengers, that God ſente to reforme his law, it is euidente in this, that all the Prophetes were ſlayne amonge them. This externall churche then did erre, this externall churche refuſed the trueth of Gods law. This externall churche did perſecute the Prophetes. And yet did not the Prophetes thinke, that they coulde caſte them out of his true churche, or make them not true members of his people, to whiche the promiſſes were made. Neither did the Prophetes for that cauſe ceaſe to call for a redreſſe of the pure law and ceremonies of God, and worſhipping him accordyng to his holy worde. They did not reſtraine to tel euen thoſe, that ſaid they were the choſen people of god, the electe vineyarde of God, the citie and habitacion of God; that they had forſaken the law of God, that they folowed their owne deuiſes, that they worſhipped God in vayne with their owne tradicions. And therfore that he would not acknowledge them any more for his people: that he woulde ſette his vineyarde open to ſpoile: that he would bringe his owne citie into thraldome and captiuitie. After the captiuitie of Babilon, when the ſame churche was reſtored, and his people taught by aduerſitie to reforme the law, and receiue againe the right worſhippinge of god apointed in his word: it continued not many yeares, but that it was agayne corrupted horribly, and led farre out of the way, folowinge againe their owne phantaſies. For when Chriſt him ſelfe came, for whoſe cauſe God had ſo preſerued that people, they ſayd, that they had Moyſes lawe, that they were the ſede of Abraham, that they were the choſen people and true churche of God: that he wente aboute to take away the lawe and deſtroy the temple, and for that cauſe did they put him to death. In like maner did they vſe ẏ Apoſtles. They reproued their doctrine as vaine and phantaſticall: they caſte them out of their Synagoges as Schiſmatikes and Heretikes. Yea and, when they did this, they had in face of the worlde thoſe thynges, wherin the churche is compted to conſiſte. They had doctrine out of the law of God. They had the miniſterie of the ſame by their Prieſtes and Doctours. They had the ſacrament of circumſicion as the couenant, wherby they were admitted as the people of God. They had the other ceremonies, wherin they were practiſed to the confirmacion of the ſame. They had the counſels wherby the condẽpned Chriſt, wherin they condempned the Apoſtles and refuſed their doctrine. They blamed their predeceſſours, for that they had killed the Prophetes: and yet they perſecuted Chriſte and his Apoſtels. Shal we thinke therfore, that the Apoſtles were not of the church? or rather ſhal we iudge, that they, which haue the gouernemente of the law and ſacramentes, and to the world haue the face and name of the churche, may ſo fowly erre, as they may refuſe the true doctrine of gods lawe, and perſecute the miniſters and ſetters forth of the ſame? There lacked not gods promiſſes amonge the Iewes. There lacked not ſucceſſion of biſhops and prieſtes. There lacked not opinion of great holineſſe and auſteritie of life. There lacked not great ſkil and knowledge of the law of god. And yet is it moſte euident that they erred: that they refuſed the trueth, that vnder the name and gay ſhewe of the church, in very deede they perſecuted the church. Why ſhal we not thinke that the like may bee in this time? Yea why ſhould wee not ſurely perſwade our ſelues, by the courſe of gods doinges, and by the teſtimonies of holy ſcripture, that the like is now in this our time. Our ſauiour Chriſt and his Apoſtles haue left warning abundantly, that it would bee ſo in his churche, and eſpecially towarde the ende of the worlde. Chriſte him ſelfe prophecied that deſolacion ſhould ſtand in the holy place: that is, in the churche. Saint Paule witneſſeth that Antichriſt ſhould ſit in the temple of god, that is, in the church. Where it is alſo ſignified, not that he ſhould be an abiecte in the churche, but a power auauntinge him ſelfe aboue the name of god. Peter ſaith, that in the church ſhould bee maiſters and teachers of lies. Paule affirmeth for ſuretie, that, in the latter dayes, ſuche ſhall come, as ſhall geue eare to doctrine of the dyuel, forbidding to mary and eate ſuche meates, as god had created to bée taken with thankes geuinge. These thinges were prophecied to come, not amonge Turkes and Sarasens, not amonge Infidels and Paganes, but in the temple of god, in the church of god, in the ſocietie of them that did profeſſe Chriſt. We haue therfore great cauſe to marke the working of god, by the example of the old church amonge the Iewes. Wee ſée that the Prophetes were firſte vexed by thoſe, that bare the name of the churche, and ſhold haue moſt gladly receiued them. We ſée that in Chriſtes time and the Apoſtles, not the Gentils firſt refuſed the comfortable tidinges of the goſpel, but they that called them ſelfe the people of god, and had amonge them the cuſtodie of his lawe and ceremonies. Euen in like maner we haue to thinke that he wyll do in this time, ſeinge he hath of the ſame forewarned vs. For euen as the olde lawe and religion of the Iewes was a ſhadow and paterne of the true relygion brought in by Chriſt; ſo the ſtate and maner of that church may well reſemble the ſtate of Chriſtes church in the latter time. As the olde church therefore towarde the ende did forſake the lawe and right uſe of gods ceremonies, and, beinge deuyded in ſundry ſectes, deuiſed new worſhippinges accordinge to theyr owne phantaſies: in ſo muche that, for the maintenãce therof, they refuſed Chriſt and his Apoſtlꝭ: So in like maner may we iuſtly thinke, that the church, after Chriſt towarde the ende of the world, ſhall departe from the trueth of Gods worde, & right miniſtration of his ſacramentꝭ, cleauinge to theyr owne interpretacions: & beinge deuided in ſundry ſectes of religion, for the defence of the ſame, ſhal refuſe and caſt out of the church ſuch, as god will ſende to renew the trueth of his holy word and goſpel. Wherfore it ought to comfort and confirme vs, and cauſe vs to thinke, that wée be in déede in the churche, rather then to feare vs: ſeinge they, that in the pompe and glorious face of the worlde ſéeme to haue the gouernmente of the churche, doth refuſe vs and take vs to bee none of the church. For ſuche they were alwaies, that from the beginnynge refuſed and oppreſſed the trueth: Such they were, that vexed the Prophetes: Such they were, that refuſed Chriſt: Such they were, that perſecuted his Apoſtels. Here perhappes ſome curious conſcience wil be pricked, and thinke it is not likely, that god of his great mercy would ſuffer his churche and ſo great a number of people to erre ſo many hundred yeares. But wée muſt beware, how by oure reaſon of likelihoode, wée enter into gods iudgement and vnſcrutable prouidence. We muſt thinke of him, as the courſe of his doinges ſheweth vs. Wée muſt thinke of him, as his holy worde teacheth vs. Wée muſt not thinke of him, as oure

fonde

ſounde reaſon wyll leade vs. Is it not merueilous, thinke you, and to oure iudgement vnſcrutable, that thouſandes of yeres hee ſuffered all the nations of the earth to bee noſelled in Idolatry, and opened his knowledge to onely one little people of the Iewes? Is it not merueilous, that, of .xii. partes of that one people, he ſuffered .x. and a halfe to forſake him at one time: yea & that one parte, that remained, not a fewe tymes cleane to geue ouer the true worſhypping of god: ſo that in thoſe dayes he might ſcante ſéeme to haue any true church vpon the whole face of ẏ earth. Be not theſe thinges beyonde the likelyhoddes of mans féeble reaſon? May wee not ſay with S. Paule, O vnſcrutable and botomleſſe deepenes of his diuine iudgemente; and leaue to ſéeke what is likely in his doinges? The Iewes were his choſen people, from which the ſauiour of the worlde ſhould riſe. They had among them his lawe and ceremonies,

nies, his aboundant promiſſes and ſacramentes. They had his tabernacle, out of the which he, as preſence, ſpake unto them. If then the depenes of gods iudgement were ſuche towarde them, that hee ſuffered them ſo ofte and ſo longe to go aſtraie: and ſence Chriſtes time moſt miſerably. 1560. yeres hath ſcattered them upon the earth: may we not feare the like alſo amonge us in this latter time? Doth not S. Paule put us in feare, that, if god did breake away the naturall braunches of the Olive, he would alſo, if cauſe were geuen, cut of thoſe, that were but graffed on beſide nature? Doth not Chriſte in the goſpell forewarne us, that in the latter dayes ſhould bée ſuche miſchiefe and blindnes in the churche: that euen the electe ſhould be in daunger to be ſeduced? And ſhall we then hope at that time to ſée the true churche in ſo triumphant glory of the world, as it ſhal make euen the greateſt Emperours and Princes of the earth in worlde, might & power ſubiect vnto it? Truly that agreeth not with Chriſtes prophecie, nor the warninges of the Apoſtels, wherein they tel vs of the greate daunger, that ſhal happen in the churches, towarde the ende of the worlde. That it may not be thought to be my onely phantaſie that the aduerſarie of Chriſte ſhall in the latter daies ſit in the churche, and beare the face of religion: Heare you what Hylarie ſayth, Contra Auxentium. In whoſe time the Arrians, by the furtherance of the Emperour, and a number of Biſhops, toke on them the name of the Catholikes, and perſecuted the true chriſtian churche. Ye do ill (ſaith he) to be in loue with walles: ye do ill to worſhip the churche of God in gay houſes and buildinges: ye do ill to bring the name of peace vnder them. Is it not certaine that Antichriſt ſhall ſit in them? Mountaines, woddes, marrices, priſons, dennes are more ſafe for me. For in thoſe the Prophetes, either Voluntarely abydinge, or caſt thether by Violence, did propheſie by the ſpirite of god. How could a man more plainely declare that the true churche both then was and after ſhuld be vexed and perſecuted by thoſe, that in ſight and power of external gouernment, were taken for the church. It is notable alſo that Auguſtine hath De ciuit. dei. lib. 20. ſpeaking of Antichriſte, Rectius putant etiam latine dici ſicut in græco eſt: non in templo, ſed in tẽplum dei ſedeat, tanq̃ ipſe ſit templum dei, quod eſt eccleſia. Some thinke it were better ſpoken in Latine as it is in the Greke, as to ſay, that Antichriſte ſhould ſit, not in the temple of God, but as the temple of God: as though himſelfe were the temple of God, which is the churche. What Bernarde dyd thinke of the churche in his time aboue 400. yeres agoe, it appereth in diuers places. There is no ſounde parte now (ſaith he) in the clergie: it remaineth therfore that the man of ſinne be reuealed. And in another place. All my friendes be now become my foes, all my neighbours are now become aduerſaries. The ſeruauntes of Chriſte do ſeruice to Antichriſt. If I ſhould recite out of authours and Hiſtories al ſuch teſtimonies as ſerueth to this purpoſe, I ſhoulde be a greate deale longer then this place requireth. I will therfore at this time omitte them. Seyng therfore it doeth euidently appere, that in the latter time they ſhall beare the name of the churche, whiche in dede be not the right churche: wee muſt loke diligently that wee geue not ouer to euery power that wil claime the name of the churche, but conſider whither the true marke of the holy churche be amonge them. Chriſte the true paſtour, noting whiche were his ſheepe, ſaieth, My ſheepe wil here my voyce. And as by his worde and voyce he calleth them into his folde, ſo by his ſacramentes there he marketh them. The right churche therfore as the folde of Chriſte hath the true worſhip of God and vſe of his ſacramentes accordyng to the ſame, for the due markes therof. So muche then as the worde of God and vſe of the ſacramentes be corrupted amonge any

What is the true marke of Chriſtes churche.

people, or congregacion, ſo farre ſhall that company be from the ſtate of the true and perfit churche of Chriſte. Therfore it is eaſie to iudge what is to be thought of them that leaue ỹ worde of God, and worſhip him well nere altogether with their owne deuiſed phãtaſies. That the ſcripture, which is the voyce and worde of God, is the true triall of the church, wee haue good authoritie in the auncient fathers. S. Auguſtine contra Petilianũ. cap. 2. The controuerſie is betweene vs & the Donatiſtes (ſaith he) where the churche is. Therfore what ſhall wee do? ſhall wee ſeeke it in our owne wordes, or in the wordes of our lorde Jeſus Chriſte the head therof? I thinke wee ought rather to ſeeke it in his wordes, that is trueth, and beſt knoweth his body. Therfore they be not to be compted the churche, that with their owne wordes will ſay they be the churche: but they whoſe doctrine agreeth with the worde of Chriſte that is head of the churche. In like maner hath Chriſoſtome in Mat. cap.

church

cap. 14. Wherfore (ſaith he) in this time all chriſtian men ought to reſorte to the ſcriptures. Becauſe in this time ſince hereſie is come into the churches, there can be no other proufe of true chriſtianitie, nor any other refuge for chriſtian men deſyring to know the true faith, but onely the holy ſcriptures. For, before it was ſhewed by many meanes which was the churche of Chriſte, which was gentilitie. But now to them that will knowe, whiche is the right churche of Chriſte, there is no meanes but only by the ſcriptures. S. Auguſtine hath the like in many wordes in the .16. cap. contra epiſtolam Petiliani, whiche I let paſſe here for breuities ſake. The place beginneth in this wiſe, Vtrum Donatiſtæ eccleſiam teneant, non niſi diuinarū ſcripturarum canonicis libris oſtendant. Quia nec nos, ꝓpterea dicimus nobis credere oportere quod in eccleſia Chriſti ſumus. &c. Wherfore a Chriſtian conſcience, that in this daungerous time will walke ſafely, muſt take the word of god to be his only ſtaie: muſt take the holy ſcripture to be as well the rule whereby he ſhall meaſure the true paterne of the church, as the very touchſtone wherby he muſt trie al the doctrine of the ſame. For god in time paſte ſpake by his prophetes many and ſundry waies, but laſt of all by his dere ſonne. Whoſe doctrine, how perfite it was, the woman of Samaria witneſſeth ſaying. When Meſſias commeth he ſhall tel vs all thinges. And the ſame Meſſias hym ſelfe ſaieth I haue made knowen to you all that I haue heard of my father. And therefore ſendinge his Apoſtles hee ſaith, Teach them to obſerue all that I haue commaunded. As if he had ſayd, ye ſhall declare vnto the gentils not whatſoeuer ſhal ſeeme good to your ſelfe, but thoſe thinges that I haue commaunded you. Thoſe thinges therfore are to be hard, thoſe thinges we muſt ſtay vppon: In thoſe we muſt ſeeke our ſaluation and life. What ſoeuer is not agreeinge with them, muſt be caſt of and compted of no forſe. So ſaieth Origine. Wee muſt nedes cal the holy ſcriptures to witnes. For our ſenſes and declarations without thoſe witneſſes haue no credite. So ſaith Hierom. That hath not authoritie in the ſcriptures, is

In Hierem. Hom. 1.

euen as lightly contemned, as it is ſpoken. And againe in pſal. 86. Conſider what he ſaith. Which were in it, not which be in it. So that, except the Apoſtles, whatſoeuer ſhould be ſpoken afterwarde, let it bee cutte of: let it not haue authoritie. Therfore be one neuer ſo holy, after the Apoſtles, bee hee neuer ſo eloquent, he hath not authority. Becauſe the lord wyll make his declaracion in the writinge of people and princes that were in it. In that place Hierome at large declareth that the doctrine of god muſt bee proued by ſuch wrytinges as were in the churche until the Apoſtles time, and thoſe that after folowed to bee of no ſufficient authority, were they neuer ſo holy. Let vs ſtay therefore upon the canonical ſcriptures and holy worde of god. For (ſaith S. Cyprian) hereof ariſe ſchiſmes, becauſe we ſeke not to the head, nor haue recourſe to the ſpringe, nor kepe the commaundementes of the heauenly maiſter. Let vs aſke Peter (ſaith Ambroſe) let vs aſke Paule if we wyl finde out the trueth. And Chriſt him ſelfe biddeth vs ſcarche the ſcriptures and not preſume of our owne ſpirite vpon vnwritten verities beſide the worde of

God

See fol. 11 above

god. What credite is to bee geuen to thoſe that ſo ſpeake, Chriſoſtome teacheth vs. As Chriſt (ſaith he) when hee vnderſtode that they ſayde commonly of hym that hee was a deceiuour, to purge him ſelfe of that ſuſpicion witneſſed that hee ſpake not of him ſelfe, becauſe he ſpake out of the lawe and prophetes: euen ſo if any man ſayinge that he hath the holy ghoſt ſpeaketh of hym ſelfe and not out of the goſpele, wee muſt not beleue him. For as Chriſt ſaid the holy ghoſt ſhall not ſpeake of him ſelfe, but ſhall declare vnto you thoſe thinges that it hathe hearde. That is, thoſe thinges, that I haue ſpoken, he ſhal confirme. Theſe wordes of Chriſoſtome cleane ouerthroweth ẏ ground of all your vnwriten verities beſide the worde of god, much more ſuch doctrines as be expreſly againſt the ſame, as is your ſole receiuinge and communion vnder one kind. Wherfore neither your multitude of ſundry nations, and great learned clerkes, neither the continuance of .ix. C. yeres (if it were ſo,) neyther the name of your holy mother the churche, which you ſo often repete, can bee

bee any ſure proufe of your doctrines without the expreſſe teſtimonies of the ſcripture to witnes the ſame. For the holy ghoſte, whiche you aſſure your churche of, doth not ſpeake of him ſelfe (ſaith Chriſoſtom) but confirmeth that Chriſte ſpake before. After that you haue at your pleaſure in ſundry partes of your treatiſe charged him that you write againſt with folly, raſhnes, arrogancie, and impudency, euen in thoſe pointes that the ſame crimes may bee more iuſtly retourned to your ſelfe and yours: in this place alſo you indeuour to debaſe and diminiſhe his eſtimation, extenuatinge his age, continuance in ſtudy of holy ſcripture, and maner of life, in compariſon of your late holy fathers, which you doo greatly extolle. Such is your ſhiftes, when the matter will not healpe it ſelfe, to transferre your talke to the perſons, & by ſcornful diſdeining of other to procure your ſelf authoritie. What your opinion is of him, your writing declareth: but they, whiche haue bene of longer and better acquaintance with him then you are, do right well know, and in his behalfe do proteſt, that .xx. yeres ſence he was able fully to haue anſwered ſtronger argumentes for theſe matters, then any that you haue brought at this time. But whatſoeuer hee is to you, god bee praiſed in him, he ſo liueth, as the moſt malicious of your parte cannot iuſtly blame him: and his learninge is ſuche, as, when the matter ſhalbe tried, I doubt not, but it wil fal out, that he in his .xl. yeres age, and ſuch other, whom in like maner you diſdaine, ſhal ſhew more true diuinitie, then a many of your hoare heades and greate reading clerkes, as you thinke: whoſe authoritie and name alone ye iudge ſufficient to beare downe whatſoeuer ſhall bee brought againſt them.

13. Cap.
Of reall preſence.

Towarde the ende you ſhewe your opinion of reall preſence of Chriſtes body in the ſacramente, and in that parte blame vs, as though we had more acquainted our ſelfe with Iſmael and Agar (as you ſay) then with Abraham and Iſaac: thereby ſignifying that we miſdoubted the almightie power of god in bringinge that to paſſe, whiche he promiſeth or ſpeaketh in the inſtitution of his ſacramentes. But I muſte needes iudge this to bee in you, eyther ignorant blindnes, or hatefull malice. Blindnes, if you do not vnderſtande and ſee, that in this controuerſie we ſtay not vpon gods omnipotency: malice, if you know it and vpbrayde vs with the contrary. We graunt as freely as you with Abraham and Iſaac, That god is able to performe whatſoeuer he doth promiſe. Wee graunt as freely as you with the Angell, That no worde is vnpoſſible to god. We graunte as freely as you with Dauid, That god hath done whatſoeuer his wyll was to doe. We graūt with the holy fathers, that a greate and

mers

merueilous mutation and change is made in this ſacrament by the power of gods worde. Wee deteſt euen as muche as you all ſuch, as ſee no more but common bread or a bare ſigne in this holy ſupper: neither can wee thinke well of you, when you doe ſo falſely charge vs with that aſſertion. But how can you ſhew, that it was gods holy wil to haue ſo many miracles wrought, as you without neceſſitie doe make in this ſacramente? Yea and of ſuch ſorte as be contrary to the maner of all thoſe miracles, that the holy ſcripture mencioneth to bee wrought by his diuine power. Moyſes turned his rodde into a ſerpent: but all that were preſente ſawe that it was a ſerpent. He made water miraculouſly to come out of the rocke: but al the children of Iſraell ſaw and taſted of the water. Chriſte tourned water into wine: but all the company dranke and felte it to be wine. The ſame is to bee ſaide of all the reſidew of merueylous workes. And when gods power had miraculouſly tourned theſe thinges, that, into the whiche they were tourned, reſerued and kepte that nature, that was agreable to ſuche a thinge. The ſerpent had the very nature of a ſerpent: the water was of ſuch nature, as it behoued water to be: the wine loſt not the right nature of wine. Otherwiſe it may ſeeme rather a iudglinge then miraculous workinge. You neuer reade in all the courſe of the ſcripture, that gods power tourned the ſubſtance of any thinge, and left the qualitees of the other thinge that it was before: ſauing onely in this caſe that you imagine it. God is able to turne darkenes into light, and light into darkenes: but it were madnes to require at gods almightie power to make lighte, and not to haue a ſhininge, that is, to make lighte, to be light and not to be light all at ones: or to make light & darkenes all one. This were nothing but to peruert the order of gods wiſedome. Do you not this in the ſacramente, when you apoint the body of Chriſt to be without quantitée, proportion and figure, or to be in a thouſand places at ones: which is proper only to his diuinitie? Is not this to take away the nature of a body from his body, and in déede to affirme it to be no body? And yet wee ſay not, but that god is able to worke that alſo, if it be his pleaſure. But we ſay it was not gods will and pleaſure in ordeining the ſacrament to haue it ſo. For neyther is there any neceſſitie, that ſhould conſtraine him to it; nor doth his word teach vs, that euer hee did the like. Oh ye wyll ſay we muſte beleue Chriſtes wordes, *This is my body*, which be of as great power now, as they were in the parlour at Hieruſalem, to make the very body of Chriſte really and carnally preſent: and ſo the Catholike church (ſay you) doth teache vs. Wherefore vpon this veritie once ſetled, diuers other

ther thinges muſt of neceſſitie followe by drifte of reaſon, although they bee not expreſſely mencioned in ſcripture: as the adoration of the ſacrament, the turninge of the ſubſtance of bread and wine, the beinge of Chriſtes body in many places at ones. &c. In dede ſir ſuch is the vanitie of mans reaſon in gods holy miſteries. For when it is once departed from the true ſence of gods worde, it draweth in, as it were by linkes, a number of other abſurdities: none of which can haue any profe in ſcripture, ſeing the firſt rote of them came not out of the true ſence of ſcripture. Euen ſo, when you had deuiſed and geuen to Chriſtes wordes another ſence, then the meaninge of them doth importe, no maruel, if the ſame reaſon do leade you to a multitude of other doctrines, not only beſide the worde of god, but expreſſely againſt it. Whether that interpretacion, that you make vpon theſe wordes, do more agree with the ſcripture and grounde of our faith, then that which we teach: any indifferent man, that is not contentiouſly bente to the one parte or to the tother, may eaſely diſcerne. Your ſence is, when Chriſt ſaith, This is my body, that the naturall ſubſtance of the breade, which Chriſt toke, was turned into the naturall ſubſtance of the very body, that Chriſt dyed in: notwithſtandinge that the colour, taſte, forme, and power to norishe, that were before in the ſubſtance of bread, doth ſtill remayne: And yet vnder thoſe qualities and accidences of bread, is really conteined the natural body of Chriſt, hauing neither bignes, nor any proportion or ſenſible qualitie rightly apperteininge to ſuch a body. To expreſſe this your meaning, you vſe to ſay, that the bread is transſubſtantiate into the body of Chriſt. In what tonge or language was it euer ſeene? In what authour was it euer redde? that Sum, es, fui, the verbe ſubſtantiue might be interpreted by tranſſubſtantiare? Or if the proprietie of the wordes wil not in any wiſe admit that ſence: what one ſentence or clauſe haue you in all the courſe of the bible, that vnder the like wordes can receiue the like interpretacion? Or what prouſes can you bringe by conference of other places of the ſcripture, that theſe wordes in this place ought of neceſſitie in this maner to be interpreted? If neyther the proprietie of the tounge can beare the ſence, nor you can bring any examples or prouſes out of the worde of god, where vpon men in ſo weightie a matter may ſtay their conſciences: is it not extreame crueltie in you, vnder payne of damnation to compel them to beleue it? Here you wil burden vs with the authoritie of the holy catholike churche: which, as you ſay, hath alway receiued & alowed that interpretacion. Vnto this I anſwer, that the catholike churche of Chriſte neuer generally receiued the meanynge of any ſentence, but that they gathered the ſame, either by examples of yͤ like, or els by grounded reaſons, taken out of the ſcripture, declared, that of neceſſitie it muſt be ſo vnderſtanded. This rule was appointed to the churche by Chriſte and his Apoſtles: who in their doubtes willed men, *Scrutari ſcripturas*, to ſearche the ſcriptures. Therfore when the churche decreed againſt the Arrians and other Heretikes, that in this ſentence, *In principio erat verbum*, the wordes was in the beginnynge, that *Verbum* was to be taken for the perſon of the ſonne of God: Or when they decreed, that the ſonne was *eiuſdem ſubſtantie cum patre*, of the ſame ſubſtance with the father: they ſtayed not onely vpon their owne conſente and authoritie: but brought a greate number of proufes out of the ſcripture, that it muſt of neceſſitie be ſo taken: as it appereth in Cyrill and other of the holy fathers. Now then if this, that you defend, be the iudgement of the catholike church: it hath vndoubtedly good proffe in the ſcripture; or if you can bringe for it no ſuch teſtimony oute of the worde of god, it is euydent that you do wrongfully father this interpretatiō vpon ẏ holy catholike churche, and vnder the couert of that name you do promote & ſet forth your owne errour. And this much for your opiniō. On the tother parte, when wée interprete Chriſtes wordes; wée ſay it is a figuratiue ſpéeche, and ſuche as the holy ghoſt often vſeth in the inſtitucion of ſacramentes and ceremonies, or in the deſcriuyng of other miſteries. The figure is named Metonymia: when the name of the thynge is geuen vnto the ſigne. When theſe wordes therefore be laied vnto vs, This is my body, wée ſay it is moſte true. But miſtically, ſacramentally, figuratiuely, not really and accordyng to the naturall ſubſtance. For this interpretacion wée haue a number of examples out of the canonicall ſcriptures. God, ſpeakynge of circumciſion, ſaieth: This is my couenante. And yet was circumciſion not the couenante indéede, but the ſigne & teſtimonie, wherby they were aſſured to be the people of God and partakers of his promiſſes. The Paſchale lambe is called the Paſſeouer: and yet was it but a teſtimony and remembrāce of the greate benefite of God, in paſſyng his plague from them. This is the victorie, ſaieth S. Paule, that ouercometh yͤ worlde, euen your faith: And yet is not our faith the victorie it ſelfe, but the inſtrument or meanes wherby the victorie is gotten. In like maner diuers other places: As, I am a vyne: God is a conſumyng fier: The ſeuen kine be ſeuen yeres: And that S. Paule hath to the Corinthes. Petra erat Chriſtus: The rocke was Chriſte. And yet was not the rocke Chriſte himſelfe really: onleſſe ye will take it, as hee there doeth indéede, for the ſpirituall rocke. For that ſpirituall rocke was Chriſte himſelf verely and indéede, not only in a miſterie or ſignification. So in the Lordes ſupper, if you take bread for ſpirituall bread, as Chriſte doth in the .vi. of John: I will ſay with you, that it is really and eſſentially the verie true body of Chriſte it ſelfe, and not onely miſtically. If wée had not theſe many examples with a greate number moe in the holy ſcripture to iuſtifie our maner of interpretacion: yet the very wordes, whiche the ſpirit of God by ſinguler prouidence hath vſed in the Euangeliſt and S. Paule, doeth manifeſtly leade vs vnto this ſence, rather then to that you haue deuiſed. For in yͤ ſeconde parte of the ſacrament, where Math. and Marke ſay: This is my bloud of the new Teſtament. That, Luke and Paule vtter in this maner: This is the new Teſtament in my bloud. Whiche can not be otherwiſe vnderſtande, but that this ſacramẽt is a teſtimonie or pledge of his laſte will and giftes of our ſaluation, confirmed by his moſte precious blood. Wherfore if you ſay neuer ſo often times with Math. and Marke, This is my body: This is my blood: wee wyll repete as often with Luke and Paule, who were led with the ſame ſpirit, This is the new Teſtament in my body and blood. This interpretacion and meanyng of Chriſtes wordes, which wée gather by conference with other places of holy ſcripture, is confirmed alſo by the conſent of the aunciente fathers in many places. Whoſe teſtimonies I wil recite more copiouſly: partely, becauſe you ſéeme to ſignifie, that they altogether make for you in this matter: partely, that all men may ſe how vniuſtly your ſorte doo terme vs Figuratores, becauſe wée interprete that ſentence by a figure, wheras it is not our deuiſe, but the expoſicion of all the aunciente fathers of the primatiue churche. Firſt I will beginne with Auguſtine contra Adimantum cap. 12. There it appereth that Adimantus vſed Moyſes wordes, ſanguis eſt anima, to make this fonde argument. Bloud is the ſoule, ſaith Moyſes, But fleſh and bloud (ſaith Paule) ſhall not poſſeſſe the kyndome of God. Therfore the ſoule ſhal not poſſeſſe the kyngdome of God. Auguſtines anſwer to that argument is, that this ſentence Sanguis eſt anima, muſt be vnderſtanded figuratiuely, and not litterally, as he in that argument toke it. To proue that, he vſeth these wordes of Chriſte, Hoc eſt corpus meum, Saiyng in this wiſe. Poſſum interpretari illud præceptum in ſigno poſitum eſſe. Nō enim dubitauit dominus dicere, hoc eſt corpus meum, cum daret ſignum corporis ſui. I may (ſayeth Auſtine) interprete that precept to conſiſte in a ſigne or figure. For the lorde doubted not to ſay, This is my body, when he gaue the ſigne of his body. As if he had ſaied, in a farre greater matter then this, that is, in inſtitutinge the ſacramēt of his death and our redemption, the lorde doubted not to vſe a figure, and to ſay, this is my body, when he gaue the ſigne of his body. Therfore this ſentence, Bloud is the ſoule, may ſi ner be interpreted figuratiuely. So that the meaninge of it is, that bloud is the ſigne of the ſoule or life, and not the very ſoule in deede. The ſame Auguſtine in his expoſition vpon the thirde pſalme. Iudam (inquit) adhibuit ad conuiuium, in quo corporis & ſanguinis ſui figuram diſcipulis ſuis commendauit. Hee admitted Judas to that feaſt, wherin he commended to his diſciples the figure of his body and bloud. The ſame expoſition Tertullian maketh moſte euidently in hys forth booke againſte Martion. Panem (inquit) acceptum & diſtributum diſcipulis corpus ſuum illum fecit: Hoc eſt corpus meum dicendo: Hoc eſt, figura corporis mei. Chriſte (ſaith Tertullian) made that bread, that he toke in his handes, and gaue to his diſciples, his body: ſayinge, this is my bodie: that is to ſay, the ſigne of my body. What can bee playner then this expoſition of this auncient father, if men did not ſtudy rather to mainteine partes, then to confirme trueth. His purpoſe was there to proue againſt Martion that Chriſt had a true body in dede becauſe in the ſacrament hee ordeyned the ſigne or figure of his body, and therfore afterward he addeth. Figura autem non eſſet, niſi veritatis eſſet corpus. That ſhould not be a figure of his body, onles hee had a very true body in deede. Auguſtine againe in .23. Epiſtle to Bonifacius. Si (inquit) ſacramenta ſimilitudinem quandam earum rerum, quarum ſunt ſacramenta, non haberent, omnino ſacramenta non eſſent. Ex hac autem ſimilitudine plerumq; rerum ipſarum nomina ſortiuntur. Sicut ergo ſecundum quendam modum ſacramentum corporis Chriſti corpus Chriſti eſt: & ſacramentum ſanguinis Chriſti ſanguis Chriſti eſt, ita ſacramentum fidei, fides eſt. And a littell after. Sicut de ipſo Baptiſmo Apoſtolus, Conſepulti (inquit) ſumus Chriſto per baptiſmum in mortem. Non ait, ſepulturam ſignificamus, ſed prorſus (inquit) conſepulti ſumus. Sacramentum ergo tantæ rei, non niſi eiuſdem rei vocabulo nuncupauit. If ſacramentes had not a certaine ſimilitude of thoſe thinges, whereof they be ſacraments, they ſhould not be ſacraments at all. And for this ſimilitude or likenes they commonly haue the names of the thinges them ſelfe. Therefore as the ſacrament of Chriſtes body after a certaine faſhion is Chriſtes body: and the ſacramente of hys bloud is his bloud: ſo the ſacrament of faith is faith. &c. As the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of Baptiſme: We bee buried (ſaith he) in death to Chriſt by baptiſme. He ſaith not, we ſignifie burial, but plainely, we be buried. Therefore he doth nothinge els but terme the ſacrament of ſo great a thing, by the name of the thinge it ſelfe. Sainct Auguſtines meaninge is to declare to Bonifacius, that Baptiſme might bee called by the name of faith, and that therefore the Infante baptiſed might be truly affirmed to beleue, or to haue faith, becauſe it had Baptiſme the ſacrament of faith. This he proueth by compariſon with the ſacrament of Chriſtes body and bloud; Which, for a ſimilitude or likenes, hee ſaieth is called the body and bloud of Chriſte, & that after a certaine faſhion: adding, that Baptiſme in like manner is faith. And yet no man wyl be ſo vnwiſe to ſay, that Baptiſme is faith in déede really. Wherfore the like is to be iudged of the ſacramente of the Lordes body, wherby. S. Auguſtine proueth it. This alſo is diligently to be noted that Auguſtine ſaith, all ſacraments generally be vttered by name of the thinges them ſelfe, becauſe of a certaine ſimilitude or likenes: & therfore Paule ſaith not we ſignifie our buryall, but wee be buried: callinge the ſacrament by the name of ỹ thing, as Auſtine ſaith. Againe, in Libro ſententiarum proſperi, as it is recited in the decrées De conſecratione diſtinc. 2. cap. Hoc eſt. The ſame father hath theſe words. Cœleſtis panis, qui eſt caro Chriſti, ſuo modo nominatur corpus Chriſti: cum reuera ſit ſacramentum corporis Chriſti. Vocaturq; ipſa immolatio carnis, quæ ſacerdotis manibus fit, Chriſti paſsio, mors, crucifixio, non rei veritate ſed ſignificante miſterio. The heauenly bread, which is the fleſh of Chriſt, after a faſhion is named the body of Chriſt: where as in dede it is but the ſacrament of his body. And the offeringe of the fleaſh, which is done with the prieſtes handes, is called the paſſion, the death, the crucifiynge of Chriſt, not in veritie of the thinge, but in a ſignifiynge miſtery. The gloſe in expounding theſe words of

Auguſtine, ſaith, this. Cæleſte ſacramentum, quod vere repræſentat Chriſti carnem dicitur corpus Chriſti, ſed improprie: vnde dicitur: ſuo modo: &, non rei veritate, ſed ſignificante miſterio. Vt ſit ſenſus: vocatur corpus Chriſti, id eſt, ſignificat. It is called the body of Chriſt, (ſaith he) that is to ſay, it ſignifieth the body of Chriſt. To this I will adde Chriſoſtome, Operis imperfecti Homil. 11. Si, inquit, vaſa ſanctificata tranſferre ad priuatos vſus peccatum eſt, in quibus non eſt verum corpus Chriſti, ſed miſterium corporis Chriſti continetur, quanto magis vaſa corporis noſtri. &c. If (ſaieth hee) it be ſinne to tranſferre holy veſſels vnto priuate vſes, in whiche is not the true body of Chriſt, but yͤ miſtery of his body is conteined: how muche leſſe ſhould wee. &c. What can more plainly declare yͤ figuratiue ſence of thoſe wordz of chriſt, hoc eſt corpus meū then that Chriſoſtome ſaieth, in whiche veſſels is not the very body, but the miſtery of it. For if thoſe wordes were litterally to bee vnderſtanded (as you ſay) then ſhould the holy veſſels that conteyne the ſacramentes haue in them, not only the miſtery of Chriſtes body and bloud, but his very body really in dede. Which Chriſoſtome denieth. In the. 83. Homil. vpon Mathew the ſame doctour ſaith. Si mortuus Ieſus non eſt, cuius ſimbolum aut ſignum hoc ſacrificium eſt. If Chriſt be not deade: of whom is this ſacrifice a figure and ſigne? And vpon the. 22. pſalm. Vt quotidie in ſimilitudinem corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti, panem & vinum ſecundum ordinem Melchiſedech nobis oſtenderet in ſacramento. That hee might dayly ſhew vs in the ſacrament bread and wine accordynge to the order of Melchiſedech, as the ſimilitude of his body and bloud. As before hee vſed Symbolum, ſignum, miſterium: ſo he hath here, Similitudinem. Likewiſe. Dioniſius de eccleſiaſtica Hierarchia: cap. 3. Per venerabilia ſigna Chriſtus ſignatur & ſumitur. By thoſe reuerent ſignes Chriſte is ſignified and receiued. Ambroſe alſo, De hijs qui initiantur miſterijs. cap. 9. Ipſe clamat dominus Ieſus, Hoc eſt corpus meum. Ante benedictionem verborū cæleſtium alia ſpecies nominatur, Poſt conſecrationem corpus Chriſti ſignificatur. Our Lorde Ieſus crieth, this is my body. Before the bleſſing of the heauenly wordes one kinde is named: after conſecratione Chriſtes body is ſignified. In the. 4. boke alſo, De ſacramentis. cap.

The ſame Ambroſe ſaith. Fac nobis hanc oblationem aſcriptam, rationabilē, acceptabilem, quod eſt figura corporis & ſanguinis domini noſtri Ieſu Chriſti. Make to vs this offering alowable, reaſonable, acceptable, whiche is the figure of the body and bloud of our lord Ieſus Chriſt. Here he acknowlegeth the ſacrament to bee a figure. In the. 6. boke De ſacramētis. cap. 1. He hath theſe wordes alſo. Ideo in ſimilitudinem quidem accipis ſacramentum, ſed veræ naturæ gratiam virtutemq; aſſequeris. Therefore thou receiueſt the ſacrament as a ſimilitude, but thou atteineſt the grace and vertue of the true nature in dede. This ſentence of Ambroſe conteineth our whole doctrine of the ſacramente of Chriſtes body and bloud: whiche is, that it is a figure or ſigne of his body: and yet not a bare or naked figure, but ſuche a one, as there by we atteine in dede the full grace and benefite of his body: that ſuffred for vs and was crucified vpon the croſſe, and haue our ſoules fed and noriſhed with the ſame to euerlaſtinge lyfe. Origine vppon Mathew ſaieth.

Panis ſanctificatus iuxta id, quod habet materiale, in ventrem abit, & in ſeceſſum eiicitur. &c. The ſanctified bread (ſaith he) according to that it hath material, paſſeth into the bealy, and is auoyded oute of the body. But accordinge to the prayer, that commeth to it, it is profitable: makinge that the minde vnderſtandeth and hathe regarde to that is profitable. Neither is it the matter of the breade, but the word ſpoken ouer it, that profiteth him, which receiueth it not vnworthely. And thus much haue I ſpoken of the typicall and figuratiue body. Much alſo may be ſayd of the liuely worde it ſelfe, whiche was made fleaſh and very meat in deede: whiche meate, he that eateth ſhal ſurely liue for euer: whiche no yll man canne eate. &c. Here note you, firſte, that Origine ſaieth that the mattier of the conſecrated breade of the ſacrament paſſeth into the bealy and is auoyded out, expreſly againſt your interpretacion of Chriſtes wordes, wherby ye ſay the breade is tranſſubſtantiate, and no mattier of it lefte but onely accidencies. Secondly that he calleth the ſacrament, Typicum & ſymbolicum corpus, the typicall and figunatiue body. Thirdely that he affirmeth conſtantly, that no ill man can eate the very fleſh of the seconde perſon in Trinitie. And yet that is one of the neceſſarie labels that your ſorte doeth teache to depende vpon your wrongefull interpretacion of Chriſtes wordꝫ. Wherfore Origine with this one ſentence teareth of diuers of your counterfaited Labels, that you ſtitche to Chriſtes teſtamentes by drifte of reaſon, without the warrant of his holy worde. More ouer Auſtine de doctrina Chriſt. lib. 3. cap. 9. After he hath declared, that in the new Teſtamente God hath lefte vnto his people but few ſacramentes and ceremonies, and the ſame to be vnderſtande not carnally & ſeruilely accordyng to the letter: and there for example hath mencioned baptiſme and the celebracion of the Lordes body and bloud: in the ende he addeth theſe wordes. In whiche (ſaith he) as, to folow the letter, and to take the ſygnes for

thoſe

thoſe thynges, that are ſignified by them, in a poincte of ſeruile infirmitie: ſo, to interprete the ſignes euill, is the poincte of wandrynge errour. As he counteth it a fonde and wicked errour not to interprete the ſignes well and accordynge to Gods worde: ſo, by a ſtreight litteral ſence, to take the ſignes for the thynges ſignified, he eſtæmeth a ſeruile infirmitie. What can be more plainly ſpoken againſt that interpretacion that you make vpon theſe woordes of Chriſte: wherby you doo binde vs to a ſeruile & litterall ſence of this worde, Is, and in ſuche ſorte take the ſignes of this ſacramente for the thinges ſignified, as you affirme breade and wine (whiche S. Auguſtine and the other Doctours call the externall ſignes) cleane to be tourned into the body & bloud of Chriſt. The ſame Auguſtine contra Adimãtum Manich. The Lorde ſaieth, this is my bodie, when he gaue the ſigne of his body. Alſo vpon the .98. pſal. he ſpeaketh in this maner. Ye ſhall not eate that body, that you ſe, nor ye ſhal not drinke that bloud, that they ſhall ſhedde. It is a miſterie, that I tell you, whiche ſhal reuiue you, if you vnderſtande it ſpiritually. Wyll you not yet vnderſtand, from whence our men receiued this interpretacion? will you not yet perceiue, that wee ſucked not it out of our owne fingers, but were led vnto it by the teſtimonies of holy ſcriptures and teachyng of theſe aūcient fathers? Will you not ceaſe vniuſtly to bourden vs, that wee cauill and dally vpon titles and ſillables: wheras your ſelf in this ſentence woulde driue vs to ſuche an vnderſtandyng of this one ſillable, Is, as the like is not in ẏ whole Bible. But ye will aledge for your ſelfe, as you ſignifie in your writyng, that Ambroſe, Cyprian, Chriſoſtome, and other auncient fathers haue in this caſe vſed the termes of tranſmutacion, alteration, conuerſion, tranſelementation. &c. Wherby they haue plainly declared theyr meaninge to bee as yours is: and that no bread there remayneth, but only the ſubſtance of Chriſtes body. True it is in déede, that thoſe holy fathers vſed ſuch wordes, not for that they were of your opinion, but only to thend they might more reuerently, as méete was, and more liuely expreſſe the dignitie and effect of that heauenly miſtery: wherin Ieſu Chriſt, by his vnfallible promiſſe, vnfeinedly geueth to the faith of his people the very fruition of his body and bloud, with the hole benefite of his precious death and paſſion: and, by the workinge of the holy ghoſt, meruellouſly ioyneth vs in one body together with him. Is not this thinke you a meruellous change and to mans eſtimation a miraculous worke: when by the power of the holy ghoſt & worde of god, of commen breade and wine, ſuch as we daily féede our bodies with, is made the dredful and reuerent ſacramentes and myſteries of Ieſus Chriſt: wherby (as I ſaide) he doth, not by a bare ſigne only, but verely and in dede, endow is faithfull people, and make them partakers of his body and bloud: Yea and that in ſuch ſorte, that euen as truly as the bread doth noriſhe our body: and euen as truly as the wine doeth comforte our ſpirites: ſo truly and vnfeinedly doeth the heauenly fode of his body and bloud toren and ſhed for vs, by faith in time of that holy ſupper, noryſhe, ſtrengthen, and comforte our ſoule: and, by the wonderfull workinge of his ſpirite, make our bodies alſo apte to reſurrection. Truly when I earneſtly conſider the effecte of this ſacrament, as it muſt nedes be by the trueth of Chriſtes promiſes, I confeſſe I am not able with wordes to vtter ſo muche, as in my minde I do conceiue, and together withal eſchew the abſurditie of your reall preſence and tranſſubſtantion. Wherfore I merueile not if thoſe holy fathers fearinge no ſuche inconueniences, but lokinge rather pithely to expreſſe the thinge, dyd vſe those earneſt wordes and manners of ſpeakinge: and yet mente not as you now of their wordes do gather. All though no ſimilitude can ſufficiently declare the thinge: I wyll, for the ſimplar ſorte, ſo muche as I can, indeuour by a compariſon to ſet forthe, that I do conceiue. If a temporal prince, for certaine cauſes mouinge him, would geue you a thouſand pound land by the yere, and for that purpoſe had cauſed the wrytinges to be made: The ſame wrytinge, vntill it bee confirmed by the prince, is nothinge but common parchment and inke framed into letters by ſome inferiour mans hand, neither doth it bring any effect: but when the prince hath once added to his ſeale, & confirmed yͤ graunt, it is no more called parchement or common writing, but the kinges letters patents. And now hath that reuerence, that all to whom they be ſhewed, do veile their bonetes, as bringinge with it ſome parte of the princes maieſty. Such a change is now made in thoſe trifelinge thinges, that before no man eſtemed. You alſo, to whom this lande ſhould bee geuen, would not thinke this writinge common parchement blotted with inke, but the perfite déede of your prince: wherby you were aſſuredly poſſeſſed of the foreſaid lands. Moreouer, when the prince, at the deliuery of the ſame, ſhould ſay: ſir, here is a thouſand pound land that I geue fréely to you and to your heires. I thinke you would not be ſo fonde to thinke, either that the Prince doeth mocke you: becauſe you ſée not the lāds preſently, or els to conceiue with your ſelfe, that you haue the landes really incloſed within the compaſſe of your writing. For the kinges authoritie, in ẏ writyng, geueth you as ful poſſeſſion of the landes, as though you helde thē, if it were poſſible, in your hande. And you in this caſe might iuſtly ſaye to your friende, ſhewing your letters patents: Lo, here is a thouſande pounde lande, that my prince hath geuen me. If then there bee ſo greate a change made in framyng the couenant & dede of an earthly prince: If his ſeale doo bryng ſuch force & effecte to his gifte and letters patentes: How much more merueilous change, alteració, or tranſmutacion muſte wée thinke it to bee: when the baſe creatures of breade and wine be conſecrated into the ſacrament of the euerlaſtyng couenante and teſtament of Ieſu Chriſt: wherin he geueth vs, not earthly vanities, but the precious fode of his body and bloude, remiſſion of ſinnes, and the heritage of his heauenly kingdome? how muche more of effecte muſt this ſacrament be, that is ſealed with the promiſſe and wordes of our ſauiour Chriſt: who is truth it ſelfe, and cannot deceiue any, that truſteth in him? Wherefore, to expreſſe this change of the externall elementes into ſo heauenly miſteries: to ſhewe the effecte of this ſacrament: to withdrawe the ignorant mindes of the people from the prophane cogitacion of a bare ſigne in this mattier, the auncient fathers had good cauſe to vſe ſuche wordes. And yet therein doo they nothyng at all defende your miraculous workes, that you deuiſe to be made in the Lordes ſupper. As for the ſimilitude, wherewith you woulde declare the neceſſitie of your Labels, depending vpon the firſt founded abſurditie, it is both of as ſmal force as other, that you before vſed: and you handle it with more ſluttiſh eloquence, then is meete for ſuche a mattier as this is. For the drawyng of the Capons, the ſcummyng of the potte, the ſtinkyng water, the hewyng of wodde, the puttyng on the broche with guttes, garbage and al. &c. Be phraſes and termes more meete for the kitchinne, then for the Diuinitie ſchoole, and ſuch as your ſelf, I thinke, woulde not haue vſed, if your mockyng ſpirite had not ſo rauiſſhed you, as you wiſt not what you did. If wée had reſembled your Labels, whiche you cutte out by drift of reaſon, vnto ſo baſe mattiers: you woulde haue ſayd that wée had rayled, and done otherwiſe then it became vs. But ſens your ſelfe doth ſo take them, wée muſt thinke, that God oftentimes moueth his aduerſaries to vtter trueth againſt them ſelues. But if the ſame maiſter, that you imagine to commaunde his ſeruaunte to make readie, that hee may dine, did meane onely that he ſhould ſet vpon the table ſuche colde meate, as was in the houſe, becauſe he ſaw no cauſe or neceſſitie of greater prouiſion: And the ſeruaunte, vpon his owne fooliſh head, would miſtake his maiſters commaundement, & conceyuing that he woulde haue great ſtraungers, did kill his Capons, Chickens, and other prouiſion aboute his houſe, and buſied himſelfe, with more labour then thanke, to make them readie: Do you not thinke, I pray you, that he might iuſtly be compted an vnprofitable ſeruaunt and worthy by correction to bee taught more witte, for that he putteth his maiſter to greater chargies, and himſelfe to more paines then the mattier required: if he had rightly vnderſtanded his maiſters will and commaundemente? Euen ſo ſet thoſe thynges, that you ſay foloweth by force of reaſon and argument vpon the firſt ſentence, do folow indéede only vpon that ſence, that your ſelfe doth imagine miſtakyng your maiſters wil and pleaſure, and not vpon that meanyng that Chriſte himſelfe would haue his wordes to be taken in. For all that he woulde haue done may be ſufficiently done without the working of ſo manie miracles, as you in this caſe would driue his omnipotencie vnto. Wherefore wée are not ſo muche to be blamed for miſtruſtynge the almightie power of God, whiche wée confeſſe to be in all thynges, that his pleaſure is to haue it ſhewen, as you are for preſuming vpō the ſame to haue miracles wrought beſide his will and without neceſſitie. For by the meanes of your manifolde miracles without the expreſſe woorde of God, wherupon mens faith in ſuche mattiers ſhoulde bee grounded, you make that ſacrament a torment to trie mens weake and feeble conſciences: which Chriſte ordeined to be a comfortable and ſpirituall feeding, to increaſe and ſtrengthen the conſciences of chriſtian people. This haue I thought good to anſwere your defence of priuate Maſſe: and, as a champion not meete to matche with any greate clerke, yet in ſuche ſorte as I coulde, to reſiſt your aſſaute, that you make vpon the foreſayde proteſtacion, not as good Dauid valiantly aſſauted Goliath in defence of his Prince and countrey: but as amorous Paris traiterouſly ſhotte at Achilles in yͤ behalfe of his loue Helena.

For neither is it Goliath that you fight againſt in his brauerie, as you ſay, braggynge agaynſt the people of God, but rather Achilles manfully reuengynge the inceſte committed with the ſpouſe of Chriſte, which with your amorous cuppꝭ you haue allured from him: nor yet doo you come ſtoutely as Dauid did in the name of the liuynge God, before the face of both the armies to hurle your ſtones, but priuely out of a corner ſhoote your arrowes agaynſt him as Paris againſt Achilles. You were afrayde perhappes, if he had ſeene you, that, with ſhame enough, he wold haue wronge your bowe and arrowes out of your hande: but truly I thynke hee woulde not haue ſo done, but rather, knowyng that in this quarell he coulde not be wounded, he would haue ſuffered you to ſhoote your fil, and with his naked hande receiuing your blount arrowes, in ſuche ſorte woulde haue picked them at your face, as for ſhame either you ſhould haue runne out of the place, or at the leaſt ſubmitted your ſelf & yelded to the truth, yͭ you proteſt your ſelf to haue forſaken. Wherfore as you haue the feare of God, as you haue care of your ſoules health, I moſt earneſtly exhorte you, to leaue ſtudie of contenciō: and wͭ a ſingle harte diligently to ponder the reaſons on bothe partes as the weight of the mattier requireth. Conſider, as the holy father Cyprian counſaileth, of what authoritie Chriſtꝭ inſtitucion ought to be: that wee ſhould not be ſo bolde to alter any parte of thoſe weightie & greate preceptes yͭ ſo nighly touche the ſacramente of our ſaluacion. Conſider yͭ neither Chriſtꝭ ordinaunce, nor the teſtimony of S. Paule maketh any ſignification of ſole receiuyng, or miniſtrynge vnder one kinde, but all contrarywiſe. Conſider that Iuſtine, Dyoniſius, Cyprian, the holy counſel of Nice, withal other the auncient fathers teſtifie the common maner of the primatiue churche to haue ben in forme of a communion & that in both kindes. Conſider that Chriſoſtome & other ſo earneſtly call the people beyng preſent vnto it, as they affirme them to do impudently yͭ do refraine. Conſider that yͤ maner of the primatiue church was, as Dyoniſius witneſſeth, yͭ none did remaine in yͤ church, but thoſe only that woulde communicate. Conſider yͭ Anacletus, Sixtus, the cannons of yͤ Apoſtles & Antioch counſell threatned excommunicacion & puniſhment to ſuch, as, being preſent at conſecration & readyng of the leſſons of ſcripture, woulde not receiue. Conſider I ſay, and vnfeinedly weigh theſe thynges with your ſelfe, and ye cannot chooſe but ſe that the authoritie of Gods worde and conſente of the primatiue churche maketh wholy with vs in theſe matters. And on the contrarie parte you ſhall perceiue that you haue no coullor in the ſcripture for priuate Maſſe: that you are fayne to ſeeke defence in the churches aucthoritie beſide Gods word: that your reaſons be grounded on falſe principles and ſuche as haue no proufe at all. That your aucthorities out of the doctours be either abuſes of the primatiue churche, or ſuch extraordinarie caſes of neceſſitie, contrarie to the cōmon maner, as they can not be rules to ſhew either what was then orderly done, or what now ought of right to be done. Be not theſe gaye reaſons thynke you to builde mens conſciences vpon? Priuate Maſſe is nothyng but ſole receiuyng in caſe of neceſſitie: therfore it is lawfull. The Prieſt may celebrate alone in thaſſemble of yͤ people, becauſe diuers in neceſſitie and extremitie receiued alone in their priuate houſes. The prieſt may receiue alone when the people will not, becauſe he is bounde to offer, and the people is lefte free. The prieſt may do it when he wil, becauſe he may do it in neceſſitie when the

the people will not. The miniſter may receiue alone, for companie is but an ornamente and not of the ſubſtance of the ſacramente. The Doctours in diuers places name one kinde. Therfore one kinde only was receiued of the people. How will you be able to proue that priuate Maſſe is nothyng but ſole receiuyng in neceſſitie? How wyll you be able to proue, that it is al one thing for the miniſter in the congregacion, and a laye man at home in peril to receiue alone? How will you proue that the prieſt is bounde to the frequentyng of the ſacramente, and the people lefte frée? How will you proue, that companie is but an accident or ornamente to the ſacramente, or that one kinde onely was receiued, becauſe one kinde onely was named? And yet theſe argumentes muſte be good, or els thoſe proufes and teſtimonies that you wold haue to ſéeme vnuincible, ſhall indéede be of no force. Oh ſir, for the loue of

God, weigh the mattier more indifferently. Do not diſſemble that you muſt néedes know. If you will haue your doctrine tried by the balance of ỹ ſcripture and primatiue churche, adde more weight to your ſide of the balance, or els confeſſe that your parte is the lighter. Let not the vayne ſounde of the holy churches name, where the thynge is not, leade you to be enemie to that doctrine, whiche you ſe to haue more force in the worde of God. Remember that the true churche is ruled and guided onely by Chriſtes worde and doctrine. *If you abyde (ſayth he) in my worde, then be you my true diſciples*. Chriſte is the good ſhepparde, and the churche is the folde of his right ſhéepe. Chriſte is the wiſe maiſter: and the churche is the companie of his diligente ſcholars. Chriſte is the bridegrome, & the church is his derely beloued ſpouſe. The true churche therfore will not go rangynge what way ſhe luſteth, ſhe will not learne of hir owne braine, ſhe will not folowe hir owne phantaſie. They be wilde Goates, they be not tame ſhéepe, that when the ſhepardes voyce calleth one way, will runne headlonge an other way. They be ſelfwill moichers, they be not diligent ſcholers, that leauyng their maiſters teachyng will folow their owne interpretacions. She is a frowarde and preſumptuous woman, ſhe is not an obedient wife, that will make light of hir huſbandes commaundementes, and thinke ſhe may alter them at hir pleaſure. The true ſhéepe of Chriſte therfore, the diligent ſcholars, the obediente ſpouſe, that is, the right and true churche will harken onely to hir good ſhepardes voyce, will folow hir maiſters preceptes, will obey hir houſbandes commaundementes. How then can you excuſe your ſelfe by your holy mother the churche, if you teache otherwiſe then Chriſte hath taught? and make ſuche interpretacions of your owne head as haue no grounde in his holy woorde. You do vnder that name mainteine your owne errour, ye folow not the churches authoritie. If you will harken to Chriſtes churche, to the Apoſtles churche, to the olde fathers churche, neither Chriſte, nor the Apoſtles, nor the fathers teache you any ſuche thyng. And ſo ye ſeeme your ſelfe in a ſorte to confeſſe, or els ye woulde neuer ſtriue ſo muche for vnwritten verities, and authoritie of the churche in doctrines beſide Gods worde. You needed no ſuche helpes, if your teachyng had iuſt proufe in the ſcripture and auncient fathers, as indeede it hath not. This haue I framed my anſwere vnto you in ſuche ſorte, as I truſte the indifferent reader may iudge, that my minde and purpoſe is, rather directly and playnly to confute ẏ ſumme of your vntrue doctrine, then, as you do, to ſeke ſhiftes by cauelynge to diſcredit my aduerſarie. For if I ſhould haue ſcanned euery ſillable, worde or ſentence, that in this writing hath paſſed you, and indeuoured capciouſly to haue taken aduauntage at euerie trifle, (as your ſorte is wonte to deale with vs for faute of better mattier) bothe I ſhoulde haue fallen into that faute, that I proteſte my ſelfe to miſlyke in you, and my anſwere would haue growen to ſuche a length, as it might iuſtly haue weried the reader. I haue therfore medled onely with the principall poinctes of this your Apologie, whiche may ſéeme to be of chiefe force in thoſe matters that you touche: And of purpoſe haue let paſſe many ſmall trifles, wherin bothe you might iuſtly haue béen reproued, and ſome men, I know, will thinke méete and worthy to be anſwered. I wyll now ende, and ceaſe any further to exhorte you to a more diligent examinyng and diſcuſſyng of the reſidue of your doctrines: truſtynge that your owne conſcience, hauynge now more feare of God, then you ſay you had before, wyll driue you to the ſame. Whiche I pray God may be, if not by this occaſion, yet by ſome other, when his holy wyll ſhall be.

FINIS.

¶ Imprynted at London in
Fleeteſtreete, by Thomas
Powell.

23 FE 70